

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

a

Communist Blueprint for Victory



*...to uphold and defend the Constitution
of the United States and maintain representative
government..."* [ABA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I]

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—STANDING COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION AGAINST COMMUNISM**



PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

a

Communist Blueprint for Victory

(ABA) "...to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and maintain representative government..." [ABA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 1]

American Bar Association — Standing Committee on Education Against Communism

Price \$1.00

American Bar Association
American Bar Center
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Copyright © 1964
by
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form unless the following statement appears:

"Reproduced by permission of the American Bar Association 1964"

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	V
Preface	XI
Introduction	1
A Note On Communist Sources	7
What is Peaceful Coexistence?	9
What does Peaceful Coexistence Accomplish?	27
The "Victories" of Peaceful Coexistence	31
The "Correlation of Forces"	37
Can Capitalism and Communism Reconcile Their Differences?	43
Will the Two Systems "Converge"?	49
The Role of Wars	53
Violence or Non-Violence? The "Transition From Capitalism to Socialism"	63
Dissension Within the Communist Movement: The Sino-Soviet Split	68
The Communist View of the West: An Exercise in Distortion	75
Conclusion: The Challenge to the West	83
<i>Glossary of Terms</i>	87
<i>Books for Further Reading</i>	101
<i>List of Sources</i>	103

*

FOREWORD

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE A COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY

This Committee shall study, make report and recommendations, plan and give effect to programs of education on communist tactics, strategy and objectives and encourage and support our schools and colleges in the presentation of adequate instruction on the contrast between communism and liberty under law.

(ABA Bylaws, Article X, Sec. 7: (j); (2)

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates in August 1962 unanimously adopted the above amendment to its Bylaws establishing this Standing Committee. Under this mandate the Committee has undertaken three primary programs:

- 1) A program of Bar Activities to encourage and support state, county and local bar associations to undertake meaningful activities on the local community level paralleling our Committee's activities on the national scene;

FOREWORD

- 2) A Teacher Training Institute Program encouraging and supporting schools and colleges in the conduct of summer institutes for the training of secondary school teachers who have the classroom responsibility of instructing our nation's youth on the contrast between communism and liberty under law;
- 3) A Continuing Research Program on Communist Strategy and Tactics in consultation with individual authorities of various graduate centers of study specializing in the field of contemporary Communist tactics, strategy and objectives.

The August 1962 House of Delegates action cited above signifies the continued concern of the American Bar Association for the threat posed by the international Communist movement to our national security and the concepts of human dignity and individual freedom protected by a rule of law. As early as 1950, the Association's House of Delegates created a Special Committee On Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives. Over the years this Committee published a number of interpretive reports.

That Committee's Report of May 1961 was entitled **PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE—A BLUEPRINT FOR DISRUPTION**. This Report focused attention on the

FOREWORD

publicly announced Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence as contained in the statement entitled "Statement by 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties" adopted unanimously in Moscow on December 5, 1960 at a meeting of Communist Parties and further elaborated upon in the statement by Nikita Khrushchev delivered at a top level Soviet Communist meeting on January 6, 1961. In that report translations of these two documents were reprinted in full.

In the Preface to the 1961 Report the former Special Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Henry J. TePaske of Orange City, Iowa, expressed itself in the following manner:

The (Communist) party line loses its effect when it is recognized as propaganda and its true meaning is understood. The party line must be exposed, and so explained that it will be understood by the citizens of the free world as well as by the Party elite. . . . Widespread knowledge of the Communists' tactics, strategy and objectives is essential to national survival.

In the latter part of 1963 our Committee commissioned Richard V. Allen, Chairman of the Study Program on Communism at The Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, to undertake a current

FOREWORD

documentary study of the Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence. In his examination of this area, Mr. Allen analyzed over 500 articles, documents, and speeches of Communist origin representing some 11,000 pages.

The Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, whose Director is Admiral Arleigh Burke, USN (Ret.), former Chief of Naval Operations and Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is one of the nation's outstanding graduate research centers engaged in the study of the multi-faceted threat posed by the international Communist movement. This Committee is privileged to be able to turn to such knowledgeable and responsible scholars in the field as represented by Mr. Allen and other members of the Center for Strategic Studies.

The Committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the West Publishing Company of Saint Paul, Minnesota, which has freely provided the printing and publishing services necessary to produce this study.

Obviously, no single pamphlet or publication will in itself constitute an adequate answer to Communism. For this reason, the Committee will continue to sponsor quality materials from responsible sources in this complex field.

FOREWORD

This study is informational and is not intended as a policy statement of the American Bar Association. We urge leaders of the organized Bar, teachers, and civic leaders to acquaint themselves with the facts contained herein. It is the hope of this Committee that greater knowledge of the Communist threat will be gained by all citizens, and that the real dimensions of Communist objectives will be more clearly understood in the light of principal strategic pronouncements.

The members of this Committee, and its Staff which so capably assists in this work, is in accord with our national desire to lead a peaceful existence in conjunction with all nations. But we want to "coexist" without surrendering for ourselves or for others the concepts of human dignity and the protection of individual rights under a system of due process and the rule of law. Genuine peace is one thing; the charade of Communist "peaceful coexistence" is a game of quite different intent.

July, 1964

MORRIS I. LEIBMAN
Chicago, Illinois
Chairman

FOREWORD

*Standing Committee on Education
Against Communism*

MEMBERS

H. Lynn Edwards	<i>Washington, D. C.</i>
Egbert L. Haywood	<i>Durham, North Carolina</i>
John G. McKay, Jr.	<i>Miami, Florida</i>
Raymond W. Miller	<i>Washington, D. C.</i>
William C. Mott	<i>Washington, D. C.</i>
Louis B. Nichols	<i>New York City</i>
Mario T. Noto	<i>Washington, D. C.</i>
C. Brewster Rhoads	<i>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</i>
John Ritchie	<i>Chicago, Illinois</i>
Jackson A. Wright	<i>Columbia, Missouri</i>

STAFF

Boudinot P. Atterbury	<i>Consulting Counsel</i>
Frank R. Barnett	<i>Consulting Program Manager</i>
Dorothy M. Belina	<i>Secretary</i>
Francis J. McGuire	<i>Administrative Assistant</i>
Dorothy E. Nicolosi	<i>Research Assistant</i>

PREFACE

On both sides of the Atlantic, it is now rumored that the cold war is obsolete, except for the hostility of Mao Tse-tung and his followers. Khrushchev is pictured as a "reformed" Bolshevik, dreading nuclear war and seeking to lead Soviet Communism away from world revolution toward the rule of law and middle-class affluence. From this premise, some contend that the West need not strengthen military, economic, and psychological barriers to types of Soviet aggression that may shortly cease to exist. It is urged, rather, that the next order of business is to encourage Khrushchev's "moderation" by pressing for *détente* and relaxation of trade restrictions with Russia and her satellites. Some statesmen even argue that we should prepare for the neutralization of Central Europe and the eventual disengagement of American forces from the continent. In short, on the hypothesis of a "peaceful and evolving Soviet Union," one new objective for NATO may be to preside over its self-liquidation!

Obviously, few in the West would object to reducing defense budgets if genuine peace were in prospect. But is it? Or is Khrushchev using Pavlov and the hidden persuaders to advance Lenin's unchanging goals? Suppose that the massive "peaceful coexistence" propaganda of the USSR and its overseas agents conceals an

PREFACE

ambush? Suppose that current "interoffice memos" of the Communist chiefs and ideologues call not for a reduction in tension but for an increase in class warfare, subversion, and ideological combat? Suppose Communist communiques promise *more* guerrilla thrusts into the vitals of Afro-Asia and Latin America? Suppose that very recent Communist documents (published *after* the 1963 Treaty of Moscow) openly reveal how Moscow is again using "peaceful coexistence" as a charade to feint the democracies off guard? Assuming sly motives in the Kremlin (a not unreasonable supposition after forty-four years of broken treaties and deceptions), who stands to benefit from another relaxation of vigilance?

Is today's emphasis on peaceful coexistence a "new departure" for the Kremlin, or is it the repetition of a time-tested gambit for retooling world revolution from temporary positions of weakness? It is useful to appraise Khrushchev's current tactic in the context of history; for, seen in this framework, "peace" to the Communists is simply the continuation of war by other means.

Marx himself believed that Communist and Capitalist states were wholly incompatible. Marxism as official dogma still influences the behavior of Communist elites despite the flaws in his prophecy; and Marx taught the inevitability of Communist triumph in the

PREFACE

highly developed nations of the West. In a sense, Communism deprived of its faith in the "necessary" obliteration of capitalism would be religion without belief in the certainty of judgment and life everlasting. Marxism *must* reject any genuine form of "peaceful coexistence" (on anything more than the temporary basis of expediency) or cease to be.

Lenin, the arch pragmatist of world revolution, taught his cadres how to survive through concession. Confronted by hostile bourgeois states which did not succumb to worker uprisings in the wake of the Russian revolution, Lenin devised the technique of temporary and tactical "peaceful coexistence." At Brest-Litovsk, he signed a formal treaty with Germany which allowed Mother Russia to be dismembered. Still hoping for a chain reaction of revolution now that the "weakest link" had been broken, Lenin made temporary peace with capitalism inside Russia in order to build the economic sinews of his base.

After Lenin's death in 1924, Trotsky contended that "socialism in one country"—a thesis advanced by Stalin—violated the basic principles of Marx and Lenin and betrayed the world revolution.

The savage polemics that preceded Trotsky's exile and assassination in Mexico by the victorious Stalin has obscured the fact that the disputing heirs of Lenin were not nearly so far apart as they seemed. True,

PREFACE

Stalin wanted to consolidate power in Russia before risking everything on revolution elsewhere; but Stalin never believed that Soviet "socialism" was an end in itself. More cautious than the theoretical Trotsky, Stalin wanted secure possession of the sturdiest lever and most powerful fulcrum for the eventual upheaval of capitalist citadels. Therefore, he became the manager of "planned periods of peaceful coexistence" which enabled not only Communism, but also Stalin, to survive.

It is clear, therefore, that even for the patient Stalin, "peace" was a tactic and not a goal. It gave him time to purge his rivals in the Party. It gave him time to collectivize the peasants. It gave him time to industrialize Russia. But even as Stalin led the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, he financed plots, subversion and Popular Fronts all over the world. The Communist "peace movements" of the 1930's were designed primarily to ensure that a weak (but developing) Soviet Union would not be crushed from the encircling capitalist powers; they in no way inhibited Moscow's agents from covert operations, industrial espionage, or building international fifth columns.

When Stalin's game with Nazi Germany exploded in his face, he was quick to form alliances with those hated centers of capitalism—England and America—

PREFACE

whose arsenals could furnish him the tools of defense. At war's end, he was prepared to exchange token gestures of cooperation with London and Washington for freedom to seize Eastern Europe.

He even dissolved the Comintern in 1943 to underscore the end of Communist subversion abroad, an event hailed in Western circles as the formal termination of Bolshevik ambitions and a sure sign of "evolution."

Somehow, the image-makers have made the buoyant Khrushchev seem less threatening than the cruel Stalin. Thus, we forget how often Western experts on Russia "proved" Stalin's devotion to peace by citing his reluctance to risk major war and the cynical sacrifice of foreign Communists to the interests of Russian foreign policy. In retrospect, evaluations of Stalin's foreign policy as peace-oriented seem naive. Yet, ironically, the dread hand of Stalinism was more constrained to avoid world war than the flexible fingers of Khrushchev, who sought recklessly to engineer a nuclear ambush from Cuba. (For that matter, despite the inflammatory words, Red China's relative restraint with respect to invading the offshore islands, Taiwan, India, and Southeast Asia shows Peking is not much more adventuristic than was Moscow with its wall in Berlin, its rocket threats over Suez, and its hidden missiles in Cuba.) That Khrushchev, like Stalin, often tempers an activist foreign policy with prudent regard for the

PREFACE

future of Russia only underlines the essential continuity of Soviet strategy from Lenin to the present.

Communist philosophy, consistent Soviet behavior over four decades, and recent Party directives combine to show that "peaceful coexistence" is a carefully formulated strategic course of action designed to attain revolutionary goals at minimum cost and with minimum risk to the headquarters of the conflict elite.

It behooves the American people, therefore, to ask the question, "*Cui bono?*" Who benefits, and how, from the illusion that Khrushchev is different not only in degree but in kind from Stalin or Mao? Or perhaps we should ask Lenin's question, "Who is doing what to whom?"—relevant to the cooperation of Communists with their antagonists.

Conclusion

Communist actions and Communist words prove that Communist goals are unchanged. The danger may well be greater now, in our moment of one-sided relaxation, than in the tense days of naked Stalinism. The "split" between China and the USSR may be of benefit to freedom in the long run. In the short run, polycentrism in the Communist world means we are menaced by two competing strategies: (1) the revolutionary violence of Chinese-oriented Communists in Afro-Asia and Latin America; (2) the more sophisticated Popular Front subversion of Russian-aligned

PREFACE

Communist factions. Moscow and Peking agree that capitalism and human liberty are still the primary targets. Both subsidize class war, ideological war, and guerrilla war, while debating with each other as to whether we are a paper tiger or a nuclear lamb. There is no evidence, in Communist documents or actions, that U. S. policy can be safely based on hopes for genuine accommodation or "convergence." Quite to the contrary, Moscow and Peking both assert that capitalism must be forced to disappear from the earth. Their debate is, "How and When?"

Nevertheless, the Communist bloc has weaknesses: industrial, agricultural, ideological, and political. It is vulnerable to economic sanctions and political warfare. Its disregard for human dignity saps its vitality. Communist Parties all over the world can be embarrassed, isolated, rendered impotent. Until there is genuine change in the goals and techniques of Communist dictatorship, the United States must maintain a shield of invincible military deterrence. From behind that shield, we should use our own propaganda sword to quarantine, divide, and undermine aggressive Communist power. That no genuine change in Communist aims has as yet been affected is abundantly clear from the analysis of current Communist documents which follows.

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AGAINST COMMUNISM

"As soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck."

— Vladimir Lenin, 1920

"A fight is in progress between these two systems, a life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win."

— Nikita Khrushchev, 1963

†

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

A COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY

INTRODUCTION

There is little doubt that the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the world of today would be the first choice of the overwhelming majority of mankind. To be rid of the uncertainties and tensions of human conflict, and to have assurances of being able to live, work, and enjoy the great spiritual and material benefits which the world of today offers—these are priorities for all people in all nations.

But as the days and months and years progress, we seem to be no closer to these elusive goals. The sphere of human conflict, far from having contracted, has been enlarged, and today there is virtually no corner of the globe which can isolate itself from the events which develop and aggravate such unrest.

Hence the principal feature of the absence of peace, the "cold war," is to many an integral part of contemporary international relations, something which is uncomfortable in that it threatens the American way of life; expensive, in that it imposes great financial bur-

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

dens upon the government of the people; and complex, in that its language and dialogue have become more obscure with the passage of time.

Clearly, the cold war is something every American would rather do without. But nearly every American is equally aware that settlement of the cold war on the terms now offered by our main adversary, the Soviet Union, would be unacceptable.

Unquestionably, the American people do not bear malice toward the Soviet people; but they *know* that the words of Soviet leaders, the words of Communists, are not the words used in the language of true democracy and freedom. Although it has been said that Americans have no sense of history, nearly every public opinion poll ever taken has yielded a heavy negative response to such questions as, "Can we trust the Soviets to keep their word if an agreement is made on the issues of *x* or *y* . . . ?"

While there is awareness of the realities of the Soviet record, there is also a sense of frustration which reflects our apparent inability to communicate clearly our desires to the Communists. It would seem that by now the Communists should realize that the United States really does not want war, that it wishes to make the world safe for diversity, that it wants to live side-by-side with its neighbors in peace. On hundreds of occasions the United States has officially proclaimed its

INTRODUCTION

peaceful intention vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and the Communist camp, but the unrelenting pressure on the defenses of the free world continues.

For their part, the Communists claim to be the insulted and the injured; *they*, "the champions of peace and democracy," are the ones who are "threatened" by "the aggressive forces of United States imperialism"; it is *they* who constantly "strive for the reduction of tensions" and are impeded by the "capitalist camp"; it is *they* who have thus far shielded mankind from a destructive war through their "consistent policies of peace"; and it is *they* who ultimately will "liberate" the world from the "evil system of capitalism." In a word, it is *their* policy which "represents the best interests of mankind," and that policy is called the *policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems*.

While such Communist claims are at best equivalent to their claims during the late 1940's and early 1950's that they had discovered everything from baseball to the steam engine well in advance of the rest of the world, there is a certain air of "legitimacy" to their appeal for "peaceful coexistence." The term is in itself not repugnant to our concepts, because on the face of it, it sums up some of our basic desires: we do in fact wish to "coexist peacefully" with the rest of the world.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

For Americans, "coexisting peacefully" consists in a variety of conditions which can be summed up roughly as follows: "You live there, we live here; what's yours is yours, and what's ours is ours; we will not interfere in your affairs, and you will not interfere in ours; our affairs involving you will be conducted on the principles of equality, honesty, and candor, and your affairs involving us will be likewise governed; and on this basis, we will progress, each in his own way, toward the goals which we each have set for ourselves."

If this were the principle used to regulate the affairs of state on a worldwide basis, friction and tension would be greatly reduced. But even to achieve the limited aim of greatly reduced friction and tension, it would be necessary for each participant in world affairs to have a clear-cut and unobstructed notion of what is meant by "peaceful coexistence." In other words, the meaning of the term would necessarily have to be identical for all concerned.

The nations of the free world have such an understanding of "peaceful coexistence." In their dealings with one another, a common language with precise meaning is employed.

But for the Communists, the meaning of "peaceful coexistence" is quite different. It is not a description

INTRODUCTION

of what *is* or what *should be* in the conduct of international affairs, but is rather a subtle and complex strategic doctrine designed to serve the cause of the worldwide Communist movement in its prosecution of the "proletarian revolution."

It is well to note that while the nations of the free world may acknowledge the general validity of living in "peaceful coexistence" with friends and enemies alike, they have never felt a need to define the concept in the form of a doctrine. Hence the term itself is somewhat alien to the language of diplomacy and other global affairs, and as a "doctrine" it has never found a permanent place. But because it does, as noted earlier, appear to encompass some of the basic desires of all nations, the free world has been reluctant to decline to use it for fear of appearing to be uninterested in promoting the cause of peace.

The Communists, noting Western reluctance to refuse to adopt any term which seems to signify a devotion to peace among men, have consistently sought universal recognition of "peaceful coexistence" as a regulating concept. At every opportunity they have emphasized it as the basis of their foreign policy, and have waged a singularly impressive campaign for its adoption among the non-Western and underdeveloped countries.

Because by their own admission the term is elevated by the Communists to the position of strategic doctrine,

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

because it defines so much of Communist strategy for the present and for the foreseeable future, and because it is complex, the following pages are devoted to an exposition and analysis in depth of "peaceful co-existence."

The new requirements for Americans who live in the nuclear age demand an extraordinary expenditure of effort and determination. Foremost among them is the clear-cut recognition that our way of life now faces in the Communist threat the gravest challenge of its history; but merely to acknowledge the existence of that challenge will no longer suffice. It is incumbent upon us to know the enemy and to be prepared to do combat with him on whatever level he chooses to utilize for advancing the cause of world communism.

Therefore, it is no longer acceptable to be prepared to state merely that the Communists "seek to dominate the world." It is vital to know what instruments they are now employing to further that cause. There can be no doubt that communism is in fact attempting to dominate the world, but an educated and enlightened citizenry will ultimately prove to be the single greatest stumbling block the Communists will encounter.

The citizenry of the most advanced nation in the world thus has an especially great obligation to understand and be prepared to meet the elaborate Communist strategy designed to destroy its way of life. At

A NOTE ON COMMUNIST SOURCES

the same time, the obligation of renewing the heritage and tradition which has provided the impetus to wealth and greatness that this nation enjoys must also be recognized. If the best defense against an armed aggressor is to understand his strategy and tactics, then certainly the best defense of a way of life is to be dedicated to, and mindful of, its guiding precepts.

A Note on Communist Sources

In connection with their "peace offensive," during the past few years, the Communists have increased by several times the quantities of propaganda materials made available to the non-Communist world. Nearly every major document or speech is translated into the major languages, and Radio Moscow and Satellite transmitters operate on intensive daily schedules to all parts of the world.

A striking example of this expansion is the revolution in miniature electronics which has produced the transistor radio. Now that production of such radios in quantity and at prices within the reach of nearly every citizen of the world has been made possible, additional importance has been attached to the role played by radio propaganda.

The Communists have taken the measure of this technological breakthrough, and have harnessed their propaganda activities to it. Hence it is possible for

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

the peasant in Africa to receive transmissions in his native language from the Soviet Union, and for the *campesino* of Venezuela to tune to Radio Havana. A March 1964 United States Information Agency report points out that Communist broadcasting activities reached a record high of 4,288 hours a week in 1963. This figure represented an increase of 11 per cent over the previous year, and by the end of the year broadcasts were being beamed in 67 languages.

Standardized Communist publications are easily procured in the world's major cities and by mail. For example, the official ideological journal of the international Communist movement, *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, is published monthly in Prague in some twenty different editions (the English language edition is called the *World Marxist Review*). In all cases such literature is cheap, and is persuasively presented.

The literature of communism is indeed vast. The primary sources alone, the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, number over seventy-five volumes. Thousands of secondary works have been written, including those by Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, to develop the theories contained in the "original works." But of greatest interest here is the behavior of Communists in recent times; and while the study of the remarkable continuity of the basic tenets of communism from the days of Marx in the nineteenth century to the days of Khrushchev in the second half of the twentieth century is in

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

itself interesting, it is impossible to include it in a study of peaceful coexistence.*

Thus, by focusing the attention of the reader on recent statements of the Communist movement, this study provides an up-to-date account of the goals and methods utilized in the quest to subvert and ultimately overthrow the free world. In addition to official *Soviet* statements, sources from both satellite and Western Communist Parties have been used wherever appropriate.

What Is Peaceful Coexistence?

Traditionally, Communists have always given the greatest care to defining carefully the strategic course of action to be followed over a given period of time. Tactics may vary within the period of time in which the strategy operates, but the latter will remain constant until officially changed and until that change has been proclaimed to the world movement. Hence as stated in *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, an authoritative manual for Communists everywhere, a careful distinction is made between strategy and tactics:

The term tactics often implies a political line
for a relatively short period of time deter-

* For reasons of space only. The reader will find at the end of this booklet a select list of books which probe in much greater detail both the historical and ideological aspects of the Communist movement.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

mined by particular concrete conditions, whereas strategy refers to the line for a whole historical stage.¹

The manual goes on to point out that

when elaborating the strategic line of the Party under capitalist conditions, it is important, in the first place, to determine correctly the *main aim* of the working class at the given stage and the *chief class enemy* against whom it is necessary to concentrate at the given stage the class hatred and the shock force of all the working people in order to overcome this enemy's resistance.²

Despite what has appeared on the surface to be a substantially complete "break" with the past of "Stalinism," these definitions bear a remarkable similarity to those laid down by Stalin in 1924:

Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another, but remains essentially unchanged throughout a given stage.

While the object of strategy is to win the war . . . against the bourgeoisie . . . tactics

¹ Otto V. Kuusinen (ed.), *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), p. 424; 2nd ed., rev., 1963, p. 345.

² Kuusinen, p. 425; 2nd ed., p. 346 (Italics in original).

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

pursue less important objectives, for the object of tactics is not the winning of the war as a whole, but the winning of some particular engagements or some particular battles.³

From this it is clear that Communists set themselves certain well-defined priorities to be accomplished by the concentration of "class hatred" and the "shock force of all the working people" under the guidance of the "strategic line of the Party." In individual cases the details may vary, but at heart it is always a question of assuming political power through the overthrow of the "enemy."

It is important to understand, then, what the Communists themselves understand as the "strategic line" to be followed for an entire "historical stage."

Is "peaceful coexistence" a strategy or a tactic?

The Marxist-Leninists do not understand the policy of peaceful coexistence as a tactical maneuver designed for some limited span of time, but as the strategic line designed for the whole period of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale.⁴

³ Josef Stalin, "The Foundations of Leninism," in *Problems of Leninism* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953), pp. 83-84.

⁴ "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement," *Pravda*, December 6, 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Peaceful coexistence is therefore the strategy which will carry forth the Communist revolution to the final overthrow of the free world and the establishment of worldwide Communist rule.⁵ To take it as something less important than the "strategic line," or to dismiss it as a "semantic phrase" would be to ignore the fundamental statement of the plan to accomplish the final phase of the attack against the non-Communist world.

As the principal "strategic line" of the majority of the Communist movement, peaceful coexistence is quite young. It received its initial, cautious formulation and blessing by Khrushchev at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, but escaped widespread attention in the West because of the sensational nature of the "de-Stalinization" pronouncements made at that time. It was Stalin, however, who first affirmed that "coexistence" was a temporary possibility designed to buy time. Speaking at the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1927, he said that

the period of "peaceful coexistence" is receding into the past, giving way to a period of imperialist attacks Hence our task is to pay attention to contradictions in the capitalist camp, to delay war by "buying off" the capitalists and to take all measures

⁵ It has been pointed out, however, that "what is strategy on one level is a tactic on another." The merging of the one into the other gives rise to the possibility of differing interpretations of what actually is "strategy."

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

to maintain peaceful relations. . . . Our relations with the capitalist countries are based on the assumption that the coexistence of the two opposing systems is possible. Practice has fully confirmed this.⁶

Still earlier references to coexistence may be found in Trotsky and Lenin, but until recent years it has been a descriptive slogan; i. e., it described a condition to which, however unfortunate for the Communists, they had to adapt.

Under conditions of obvious inferiority to the "capitalist world," until 1956 the Communists described their position as one of "capitalist encirclement." The major task under those conditions, according to Stalin, was to strike incessantly at the "weakest link" of the capitalist chain in an effort to break out of the "encirclement." At the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 the declaration was made that the chain had been broken, and that the worldwide revolution had begun to enter the final phase of human history, the "transition from capitalism to socialism on a world-wide scale." It is in this phase that the Communists relinquish the defensive position assumed under the previous conditions of peaceful coexistence, and go

⁶ Josef Stalin, *Political Report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the CPSU(B)*, December 3, 1927 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950), pp. 26-27.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

over to the strategic offensive under a new and enriched kind of peaceful coexistence.

While the phraseology has undergone no change—i. e., "peaceful coexistence" is still used to describe Communist policy objectives—the content of the slogan has changed radically to accommodate the new period of the offensive. Thus it is that the period of peaceful coexistence contains such non-peaceful events as the construction of the Berlin Wall and the Cuban missile build-up.

As to its specific content Nikita Khrushchev has said that

The policy of peaceful coexistence, as regards its social content, is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena.⁷

⁷ Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, No. 1 (January 1961). The famous speech delivered on January 6, 1961 has become a major document of the Communist movement. On February 2, 1962 *Time* magazine reported that President Kennedy considered it to be "one of the most significant speeches ever made by Khrushchev—Indeed, a Red blueprint for eventual world domination," and had directed the nation's top policymakers to read the speech. The most comprehensive analysis of the speech has been made for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University (see bibliography below).

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

From this definition, it would appear that peaceful coexistence, inasmuch as it prescribes "intense struggle," does not accord with the meaning of the word "peaceful." But the *Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties* of December 1960, a major policy declaration, goes into greater detail:

The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle. . . . The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence. The Communists consider it their duty to fortify the faith of the people in the possibility of furthering peaceful coexistence, their determination to prevent world war. They will do their utmost for the people to weaken imperialism and limit its sphere of action by

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

an active struggle for peace, democracy, and national liberation.⁸

It should be noted that Communists consider peaceful coexistence and the "national liberation movement," i. e., the revolutionary movement in the underdeveloped countries, to be mutually reinforcing. The principal impact of this mutual reinforcement is the ability to "limit the sphere of action" of "imperialism." Accurately translated, this means that the successes of the Communists can be turned into an advantage by restricting the freedom of action of the Western countries, chiefly the United States.

The *Statement* notes that the Communists will do everything possible "to prevent world war." It has been said that peaceful coexistence implies that, as far as the Communists are concerned, war has become an "impossibility." Khrushchev has stated:

Our foreign policy is peaceful coexistence, not war. It is the Communists who in general want to exclude war between states from the life of human society.⁹

But such general statements rarely go uninterpreted in the Communist camp, and the theme has been re-

⁸ *Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties Meeting In Moscow, USSR, December 1960*, p. 16.

⁹ Nikita Khrushchev, radio-television speech, August 6, 1961.

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

peated and elaborated in dozens of ways. In such elaborations one is apt to find a more complete candor than is present in the public pronouncements of the leaders. From the following recent statements one can gain an appreciation of the real meaning attached to the relationship of war to peaceful coexistence:

Some try to reduce the notion of peaceful coexistence to the renunciation of war. *But peace and peaceful coexistence are not one and the same thing.* Peaceful coexistence does not mean a temporary and unstable armistice between two wars, but something more complex.¹⁰

Peaceful coexistence, which is the general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries, *does not imply a temporary absence of war, or a breathing space between clashes.* Not at all. Peaceful coexistence is the only positive, constructive policy which promotes economic, social, and cultural progress all over the world.¹¹

¹⁰ H. Dona, *Peaceful Coexistence: A Basic Principle of the Foreign Policy of the Rumanian People's Republic* (Bucharest: State Publishing House, 1963), p. 2. (Italics added.)

¹¹ I. Glagolev and V. Larlonov, "Soviet Defense Might and Peaceful Coexistence," *International Affairs* (Moscow), November 1963, p. 33. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

It is fairly safe to assume that the Communists do not desire a general war at this time. They fully realize that whatever benefits would accrue to them as the result of a war would be outweighed by the damage which they would suffer. Khrushchev, speaking on August 19, 1963, stressed that the "Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses."

However, it is quite a different matter to assume that because the Communists do not view war as a realistic instrument of policy at the present time, they will never employ it. It is also necessary to point out that the Communists have differentiated between the various types of wars, and have clearly delineated those which *are* acceptable and are to be *encouraged and assisted*. (See the section on The Role of Wars, p. 53.).

Even when certain measures can be agreed upon with the "enemy" allegedly to reduce the chances of a nuclear war, as was the case with the signing of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Communists find it necessary to underscore the value of such agreements by reiterating their view of peaceful coexistence. Immediately in the wake of the Treaty, Khrushchev said:

The essence of the policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems lies precisely in *compelling* the big Western powers to renounce war as an instrument of

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

their policy and to adhere to peaceful, not military, methods of settling international problems *through the superiority of the peace-loving nations over the forces of militarism and aggression.*¹²

And a later article on the Treaty by an Estonian Communist pointed out that

in the view of the Communists, peaceful co-existence between the two systems is certainly not a passive process in which there is some sort of parallel development of capitalism and socialism, no freezing of social relationships, or *strengthening of any status quo* in the relationship between the forces of socialism and capitalism . . . but *an active and intense struggle, in the course of which socialism irresistibly attacks, while capitalism suffers one defeat after another.*¹³

While such agreements may be of limited value to the "capitalists," by this view they will redound infinitely more to the benefit of the Communists. Note that Khrushchev stresses that peaceful coexistence "*compels*" the West to submit to the policies of the

¹² N. S. Khrushchev's message to the 9th International Conference in Hiroshima for the Banning of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons, August 19, 1963. (Italics added.)

¹³ N. Shishlin, "Nuclear Test Ban Agreement: A Leninist Coexistence Principle in Action," *Sovetskaya Estoniya*, October 23, 1963. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

"superior" forces, i. e., the Communists, and that the latter statement emphasizes that such agreements by no means imply a *status quo* between Communists and non-Communists, but that "socialism" attacks and deals "capitalism" successive defeats.

The "competition" which Communists profess to pursue with the West in the name of "peaceful coexistence" likewise smacks of the language of total victory over a thoroughly vanquished enemy:

Comrades, when we speak of victory in economic competition, the point in question is not only cement or metal, but policy as well —the power of our ideas, the power of Marxist-Leninist theory, . . . the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system.

The capitalists know the cruel laws of competition: if one firm outstrips another, the stronger one swallows the weaker one. The competition of the two systems in the economic field strikes even greater fear into the hearts of the imperialists: they see that the rapid growth of socialism is increasingly *shaking the foundations of capitalism, bringing nearer the end of this system, which is doomed by history.*¹⁴

¹⁴ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 21, 1963. (Italics added.)

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

Since Communism takes an active role in "shaking the foundations of capitalism," Khrushchev certainly does not intend to operate on the "live-and-let-live" principle which dominates the Western concept of peaceful coexistence.

If it were merely a matter of a straight competition between the two powers, with the winner's only prize the satisfaction that he had won and had demonstrated that his system performed in a manner superior to the loser's, then the West would have little to fear from the bumbling and centralized economy of the Communist states. The conditions of totalitarian rule have endowed the Communist countries with an inability to compete successfully with the free world in general, and with the United States in particular.

But it is not a case of "straight competition." The stakes in this novel form of "competition" are simply the freedoms which we have fought so hard and so long to defend; and, like it or not, it is the Communists, not we, who have determined that the stakes should be set so high.

It is essential to note here that while the principle of peaceful coexistence serves as an operating code for Communist behavior in the realm of relations among nations, it has never been stated that peaceful coexistence applies *within* the boundaries of the capitalist

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

countries.¹⁵ The struggle which is to take place under the conditions of peaceful coexistence can utilize, as we shall see later, *any form of opposition*, and can be waged with *every instrument*, including violence. Thus, in colonial or newly independent countries as well as in the advanced industrial countries "anything goes" and no holds are barred:

If the class struggle within the capitalist states has internal and only internal roots, it is clear that the principle of peaceful coexistence is not applied to the relations between classes within the bourgeois countries. The class struggle of the exploited against the exploiters and the struggle of the people against reactionary regimes *cannot be dissolved by international agreement. For this struggle to cease, the causes eliciting it must be eliminated, i. e., capitalism must be liquidated.*¹⁶

In sum, this statement declares that subversion, class warfare, and the general attempt to overthrow non-Communist societies will not come to a halt until "capitalism" has been destroyed. Since capitalism actually *causes* the Communists to wage a struggle against it, capitalism must be destroyed in order to stop the

¹⁵ See below, p. 63, for greater detail on the problem of "peaceful" and "violent" internal methods.

¹⁶ Dona, *Peaceful Coexistence*, p. 31. (Italics added.)

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

struggle. This is akin to a robber telling his victim that because the latter has earned the money which he carries in his billfold, he has forced the robber to take it from him. It is because of such "perverted" reasoning that non-Communists so often feel at a loss either to understand or to explain the logic which Communism employs.

Similar confusion is often experienced when coping with the Communist claim to universal representation of the "downtrodden masses of working people," and when, in spite of the terror and inhumanity which millions have suffered at the hands of the Communists, the claim is made that the "humane" movement of Communism employs only true humanitarian methods. It taxes the imagination when claims such as this are made:

The Communist morality is the morality of the revolutionaries who are fulfilling their historic mission of saving all people from social inequality, from all forms of persecution and exploitation, and from the horrors of war, and who are establishing a system of the greatest justice and humaneness on earth.

Peaceful coexistence is the *specifically proletarian* form of the class struggle conducted on an international scale. Being specifically

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

proletarian, peaceful coexistence is at the same time also the *most humane* and the most rational form.¹⁷

Note that peaceful coexistence is reserved exclusively to the *proletariat*; that is to say, to the Communists themselves. It is because the Communists alone may implement this principle that it is automatically elevated to the level of "the *most humane*" form of struggle.

If only the Communists have a title to peaceful coexistence, then it should be clear that what the West professes to practice, i. e., its own form of "coexisting peacefully," cannot serve as a medium for improving relations with Communists or for alleviating the internal "class struggle." And herein lies the most important point: one does not *practice* peaceful coexistence, one *wages* it. Peaceful coexistence is to the Communists a *unilateral strategic doctrine which is imposed upon the "inevitably doomed" adversary through the combined inherent "moral" and physical "superiority" of the Communist system, and to which the adversary may only "respond" because he is denied a creative and participating role in determining its essence and application.*

From the conclusion that Communism determines both the form and content of peaceful coexistence has

¹⁷ I. Kuz'minkov, "Communist Morality and General Moral Standards," *Kommunist*, No. 1 (January 1964), p. 32.

WHAT IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

arisen the most brazen and extensive claim yet to be made: specifically, that *peaceful coexistence* and *international law* are identical:

Without exaggeration one can designate all contemporary generally recognized international law, as it exists today, as a code of peaceful coexistence. From this it follows that everything which is incompatible with the principle of peaceful coexistence does not exist juridically in international relations. Conversely, all the old and new principles which contribute to the development and consolidation of peaceful coexistence can with complete justification lay claim to legal validity.¹⁸

It is as much to say that all which is incompatible with peaceful coexistence "is *illegal*." Therefore, if the task of peaceful coexistence is to insure that Communism triumphs over capitalism as quickly and as efficiently as possible, the resistance which the non-Communist world may put up is basically contradictory to "law," and hence is "not legal." That such is the task of this new form of "international law" is made

¹⁸ Yevgeniy A. Korovin, "The Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties and the Tasks of the Science of International Law," *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta*, August 1961, p. 66. Needless to say, the Communists use the conventional meaning of international law when it suits their purposes.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

clear by the following statement by the dean of Soviet international lawyers, Korovin:

One of the consequences of Socialism's transformation into the decisive factor of international relations is that peaceful coexistence has gradually become an accepted principle of international law. Initially it was the expression of a peaceful "breathing space," but being a specific form of class struggle between Socialism and capitalism on an international scale, peaceful coexistence was filled with new content as the relation of world forces changed. Its ultimate objective at the present time is to ensure the most favorable conditions for the victory of Socialism in its peaceful competition with capitalism.¹⁹

While it has become fashionable in the West to speak of "victory" in the cold war as "meaningless," the Communists persist in employing it as an official goal. Needless to say, they have a very real appreciation that "victory" by means of nuclear war would very probably be a victory in the true sense for no one; but to exclude a single method of achieving victory as an unrealistic instrument of policy does not signify that the entire concept of victory has been relinquished.

¹⁹ Yevgeniy A. Korovin, "An Old and Futile Demand," *International Affairs*, April 1963, p. 100.

WHAT DOES COEXISTENCE ACCOMPLISH?

What Does Peaceful Coexistence Accomplish?

That Communists envision a genuine "victory" is demonstrated by the remarks of Khrushchev in August 1963 following the signing of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:

Today the imperialists pretend to be brave, but only in words, whereas in reality they tremble before the world of growing and strengthening socialism. And let them tremble. So much the better for us.

If everyone acted and thought in the Communist way then there would be no antagonistic classes and communism would already be victorious everywhere. However, while there are still two systems, socialist and capitalist, each system has its own policy, its own course, and we cannot but take into account the fact that two systems exist. *A fight is in progress between these two systems, a life and death combat. But we Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win.*²⁰

²⁰ N. S. Khrushchev, "Speech at the Soviet-Hungarian Meeting, August 19, 1963," *Current Soviet Documents*, August 19, 1963. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The recognition that two systems do *in fact* exist in the same world is given only grudgingly; and because there does exist in the world an alternative system to that of the Communists, the contest between them assumes, in Khrushchev's own words, the form of "a life and death combat." Peaceful coexistence fulfills the Communist objectives in this mortal combat by "insuring" that victory is accomplished with minimal losses.

It follows from this statement that the Communists are prepared to accept some losses in propelling the revolution forward, but nowhere is it made clear just what these losses could entail. Despite the possibility of such setbacks, however, Khrushchev emphasizes the certainty of triumph.

The specific function of peaceful coexistence is not, as we have found, the establishment of a mere period of relative calm on a worldwide scale. Rather, it is to provide conditions favorable for waging a many-pronged offensive at and within the non-Communist world. Above all, it creates a degree of flexibility hitherto unknown to the Communist movement, inasmuch as it allows for harnessing and utilizing the most disparate forces for the revolutionary cause:

The successes of our movement and the possibilities opening up before it, together with the responsibility devolving on our move-

WHAT DOES COEXISTENCE ACCOMPLISH?

ment, all demand that Communists pursue a well-thought-out and well-founded policy, a policy designed to bring us victory over imperialism in the conditions of peaceful co-existence.²¹

Among these "possibilities" is the fact that Peaceful coexistence creates the most favorable conditions for the fight of the oppressed nations against their imperialist oppressors. *Peaceful coexistence means the maximum support to the oppressed nations including arms.*²²

Hence wherever the Communists declare an "oppressed nation" or an "oppressed area" to exist, there weapons will be supplied to forces which serve to undermine peace and stability, and which seek to establish either a Communist regime or, at minimum, a regime favorably disposed to existing Communist states. It is remarkable that the Communists, by unilateral proclamation, have reserved to themselves the right to determine "war zones" and "peace zones," and have repeatedly emphasized the "morality," "le-

²¹ L. Sharkey, "Creative Marxism Is The Basis for Revolutionary Practice," *World Marxist Review*, October 1963, p. 10. Sharkey is General Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia.

²² Kjeld Oesterling and Norman Freed, *Peace, Freedom and You* (Prague: Peace and Socialism Publishers, 1963), p. 15. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

gality," and "necessity" for universal recognition of the "inherent justice" contained in such proclamations.

Confident that to them belongs the initiative in dictating the essence of the tasks which peaceful coexistence will accomplish, Communist leaders have labored to create the impression that time is on their side:

The policy of peaceful coexistence meets the basic interests of all peoples, of all who want no new cruel wars and seek durable peace. This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and influence of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. Peace is a loyal ally of socialism, for time is working for socialism against capitalism.²³

And again:

Peace and socialism are indivisible—this Marxist formula has a profound meaning. In an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, time works on the side of socialism, which is why the imperialist ideologists have such a dread of the very concept of peaceful coexistence.²⁴

²³ *Statement of the 81 Communist Parties in Moscow, USSR*, December 1960, p. 16.

²⁴ V. P. Kalugin, "The Magnetic Force of the Leninist Ideas of Peaceful Coexistence," *International Affairs*, No. 8 (August 1963), p. 24.

THE "VICTORIES" OF COEXISTENCE

In providing conditions favorable to the diverse forms of "struggle," peaceful coexistence acts as an accelerator of the "world revolutionary process." By not concentrating all the resources of the movement in any one direction for the support of any single objective, the Communists seek to implement the entire spectrum of techniques designed to overthrow established governments by allowing a maximum degree of "leeway" in selecting the weapons of struggle to be used at a given place and time.

In a later discussion of the forms of "transition from capitalism to socialism" this "flexibility" is examined in greater detail.

The "Victories" Of Peaceful Coexistence

Despite the relative newness of peaceful coexistence as the "strategic line" of the majority of the Communist movement, the Communists have begun to consider as "victories" for their policies agreements which the West has entered into for the purpose of relaxing international tensions:

The ideas of peaceful coexistence are penetrating deeper and deeper into the consciousness of the masses of people. The policy of peaceful coexistence has scored great successes. One was the *Moscow test-ban treaty*. Another was the resolution of the U. N.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

General Assembly urging all states to refrain from launching space vehicles with nuclear weapons into orbit. The forces of peace and the desire for peace are growing. We believe that the will of the people will triumph—that the policy of peaceful coexistence will emerge victorious.²⁵

Particular emphasis has been placed on the ratification of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 by the great majority of the nations of the world:

The conclusion of a treaty on this matter after five years of exhaustive talks was the result of the consistent position adopted by the Soviet Union and the growing pressure from the peoples of the world.²⁶

A statement by a Latin American Communist Party goes into greater detail:

The Treaty signed by the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain in Moscow is *a partial concession on the part of imperialism to the Soviet Union* and the other peoples

²⁵ Commentator Viktorov, Radio Moscow, November 11, 1963. Note that the treaty is referred to as the "Moscow Treaty." The Communists insist on this formulation for propaganda purposes. (Italics added.)

²⁶ Zenon Kliszko, "Peaceful Coexistence: The General Line of the Foreign Policies of the Socialist Countries," *Pravda*, August 9, 1963.

THE "VICTORIES" OF COEXISTENCE

who have long fought for the termination of nuclear tests. It shows that *the imperialist states can be compelled to enter into certain compromises in the matter of peaceful co-existence with the Socialist states. A new blow has been struck at the more aggressive imperialist quarters, specifically the Pentagon.* The fact that the Treaty was signed in Moscow makes it clear to all *in whose favor the scales have been tipped in the nuclear competition.* The Moscow Treaty creates better conditions for the struggle for disarmament and lasting peace; it strengthens the people's faith in the possibility of tangible gains in the struggle against imperialism. And thereby it contributes to the popular revolutionary struggle in the capitalist and oppressed countries.²⁷

²⁷ "The Views of the Paraguayan Communist Party on the Ideological and Practical Position of the Chinese Communist Party," *Information Bulletin—Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties*, No. 2 (November 1963). (Italics added.) The *Information Bulletin* was begun in the fall of 1963 by Peace and Socialism Publishers in Prague, and is apparently designed to serve as a vehicle for collecting criticisms of the Chinese Communist position on strategy and tactics. It is particularly interesting to note that the insignificant Paraguayan Communist Party was chosen to make this statement, which was later widely quoted in the Soviet Press as being representative of worldwide Communist opinion. It is very likely that the statement was "planted" with the Paraguayans in order to get the point

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Such a statement reflects the optimism which Khrushchev seemed to exude in his speech of January 6, 1961:

The policy of actively struggling for peace has imparted dynamic force to the foreign policy acts of the Socialist countries. In recent years, the initiative in the international arena has been in the hands of the Soviet Union, the Socialist countries, while *the imperialist states and their governments defend themselves with their backs to the wall, their prestige and foreign political stock have never been so low.*²⁸

Another illustration of the nature of Communist "victory" statements may be found in the Soviet treatment of the events of October 1962, when the Soviet Union sought to change the balance of power radically by attempting to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba:

There have been many tense situations threatening world peace in the years since the war. During the Caribbean crisis, for instance, the nations were brought face to face with the danger of a thermonuclear world

across without attracting attention in the press of the free world.

²⁸ Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, p. 66. (The January 6, 1961 speech referred to in note 7.) (Italics added.)

THE "VICTORIES" OF COEXISTENCE

war. In this grave situation the Soviet Union displayed a high sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind; the catastrophe was averted and peace preserved through negotiation, and, at the same time, the independence and gains of the Cuban people were safeguarded.²⁹

Every honest person will arrive at the conclusion that the solution of the Cuban crisis is a victory of reason over recklessness, of the policy of peaceful coexistence over the policy of gross wantonness in international relations.³⁰

The bald statement that "every honest person" will conclude that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was a result of Soviet "statesmanship" is as credible as the Soviet claim that American "assistance" in World War II against Nazi Germany "was of no real value in defeating the aggressors." The world knows that it was the action of the United States which prevented the deployment of intermediate-range ballistic missiles into Cuba.

²⁹ I. G. Maurer, "The Inviolable Foundations of the Unity of the International Communist Movement," *World Marxist Review*, November 1963, p. 13.

³⁰ Speech of Andrei Gromyko, Tass, December 13, 1962.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Although much of the emphasis in Communist discussion of the victories of "peaceful coexistence" is designed for purposes of propaganda, there is another side of the coin as far as Cuba is concerned: that country remains an armed Communist camp in the Western hemisphere, and the Communists consider it to be an integral part of the expanding revolutionary process. It is therefore more difficult in this particular case to dismiss completely the claims attributed to peaceful coexistence:

Overcoming the crisis in the Caribbean Sea area was a major victory of the policy of peace. . . . The result is known to all. The Cuban revolution has won, all the peoples have won, the cause of peace and general security has won.³¹

Thus on the third anniversary of the *Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties*, *Pravda* could declare:

The world socialist system as a whole has strengthened its economic and political positions on the world stage. After the victory of the revolution in Cuba, the beacon lights of communism are now shining on three continents: Europe, Asia, and America.³²

³¹ Speech of Presidium Member Nikolai Podgorniy, Radio Moscow, November 6, 1963.

³² "For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement," *Pravda*, December 6, 1963.

"CORRELATION OF FORCES"

The "Correlation of Forces"

During the 19th century the principal mechanism for maintaining the peace was the "balance of power" with the British Empire as the "keeper of the balance." It is said that the application of the balance of power concept is responsible for the long period of peace lasting from 1815 to 1914, and that the principle became weakened only after England moved into a permanent alliance system.

Some hold that, with the rise of totalitarian powers which have goals exceeding the traditional ones known to modern history, the balance of power concept has become largely outmoded. Ideological power movements such as Nazism and Communism are driven not by limited aims, but by unlimited aims most accurately reflected by the quest for nothing short of worldwide domination.

Nonetheless, the term "balance of power" is still used by many to describe the operating mechanisms of international politics in the second half of the Twentieth Century.

The basic defect of this term when applied to the free world's conflict with Communism is that it is not sufficiently inclusive, for modern scientific and technological progress has brought about the utilization of warfare techniques which do not fit into the category of "military power." And it has been noted more

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

than once that democracies experience great difficulty in thinking of strategy as being anything more than merely military.

The Communists have officially rejected the "balance of power" concept, and have substituted for it a new concept: "the correlation of forces." This term allows them to identify the present era as one in which the forces of Communism are, on balance, outstripping the forces of "imperialism," and in which "socialism" becomes the "decisive force" in determining the course of world events:

*Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism for a socialist transformation of society that determine the main content, main trend, and main features of the historical development of society. Whatever efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history. A reliable basis has been provided for further decisive victories for socialism. The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable.*³³

It is this new condition that allows the Communists to "get the upper hand" in the struggle with "imperialism":

The tables have been turned in the relations between the two main world forces. Social-

³³ *Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties in Moscow, USSR, December 1960, p. 2. (Italics in original.)*

"CORRELATION OF FORCES"

ism is the force that is now on the offensive on all fronts. Capitalism has lost its old domination for good. It is being attacked by world socialism, by the forces of the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries, and the national liberation revolutions. Under these concentrated attacks, capitalism is losing one position after another. A real possibility is being created of finally overthrowing the last system of exploitation in a short historical period and opening a road on a world scale to the society on whose banners are inscribed these sacred principles: Peace, Labor, Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood, and Happiness for all.

But this possibility still has to be transformed into reality. Final victory is drawing near but it still has to be won, and it has to be won in a struggle with a very strong enemy.³⁴

While the Communists admit that their strength may in some specific areas be inferior to that of the adversary, in the final analysis they insist that their forces are stronger, because they combine all the grow-

³⁴ V.G. Korionov, "Proletarian Internationalism—Our Victorious Weapon," *International Affairs*, No. 8 (August 1963), p. 12.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

ing physical power in the world with all the growing political and "moral" power:

The Soviet Union occupies the vanguard position not only because of her accumulated experience, but because of the accumulation of strength, which is the greatest in the world socialist system and in the world Communist movement. *Strength is here meant in all its aspects: economic strength, international political influence and prestige, technological and scientific superiority, military defense, preparedness, and so forth.* As is known to all, . . . the Soviet Union places all its strength at the service of the revolutionary liberation factors in the world, at the service of the interests of the international proletariat.³⁵

This understanding of "strength" reflects the view of Khrushchev that, for any group to "win" in the nuclear age, it is vital to utilize anything with the potential of assisting in the broad-ranging struggle with the opponent, and that it is necessary to utilize them with only an *offensive* purpose in mind. That is to say, each factor of strength is to be thrown into the arena not only to build up the general power of the

³⁵ Mosheh Sneh, "Chinese Errors," *Kot Haam* (*Voice of the People*, Israel), October 4, 1963, (Italics added.)

"CORRELATION OF FORCES"

movement, but also to be used individually when necessary to bring about the downfall of the enemy.

All the elements of strength are never possessed exclusively by the Communists; rather, they may simply seek to *utilize* existing factors for their own ends:

The nature and meaning of the world revolutionary process in our times are determined by *merging into a single stream* the struggle against imperialism on the part of the peoples building socialism and Communism, the revolutionary movements of the workers' class in the capitalist countries, the national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples, and the general democratic movements.³⁶

Note that the various movements mentioned will not of their own accord spontaneously "merge into a single stream," but that they are "to be merged." The difference would appear at first glance to be slight, but is in fact important: it is the Communists who are to do the "merging," and, having achieved that, will proceed to determine the course of the "single stream."

Perhaps the clearest summation of the relationship of "peaceful coexistence" to the "correlation of forces"

³⁶ "The Soviet Position vis-à-vis Peking," *Kommunist*, No. 11 (July 1963).

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

in Communist jargon is that of Nikita Khrushchev in June 1963:

Life has fully confirmed the correctness of the policy of peaceful coexistence. The camp of imperialism, too, has to recognize this. Take, for example, Dulles. He could not even utter these words.

When I was in America, Britain, and France, lengthy explanations were required during the negotiations on what was meant by peaceful coexistence. During the discussions in the United States with President Eisenhower it was clear that he, just as Secretary of State Herter, could not utter the words "peaceful coexistence."

Now what has happened? *The words are the same and their meaning has not changed. What has changed is the correlation of forces in the international arena.*³⁷

In short, Khrushchev contends that whereas formerly the United States and its allies refused to use the Communist term "peaceful coexistence," today they have been compelled to accept it, and that what has compelled them to accept it is the shift in the "correlation of forces" in favor of the Communists.

³⁷ N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963. (Italics added.)

CAN DIFFERENCES BE RECONCILED?

The Communists reject the concept of balancing the forces of "socialism" and "capitalism," and claim that, no matter what in desperation it tries to do, capitalism will be destroyed.

Can Capitalism and Communism Reconcile Their Differences?

When major differences and tensions between nations exist, there is a likelihood that under certain circumstances armed conflict will break out if one nation attempts to impose a solution upon the other. A more desirable method of resolving differences is to attempt, by peaceful means, to reconcile the objectives of each, or, barring that, to achieve a tacit recognition on the part of each that despite their divergence on objectives, they must live together without trying to undermine each other.

In its conflict with Communism, the West is dedicated to the peaceful resolution of outstanding differences, and utilizes each and every opportunity to proclaim its desire to settle those differences by negotiations and other peaceful methods.

Because the meaning of the term "peaceful coexistence" is so often misunderstood in the West, many come to the conclusion that, because the Communists understand that peaceful coexistence means, for the time being, the exclusion of war as a means to achieve

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

victory, relatively little importance should be attached to the Communists' insistence that, short of general war, "anything goes." The misunderstanding is frequently expanded to the assumption that, because the Communists have stated their preference to avoid war to defeat the West, they have given up their objective of accomplishing such a defeat.

Many of those in the West who in principle accept peaceful coexistence between capitalist and Socialist countries *interpret it in a different way from Marxist-Leninists*. Representatives of different outlooks often give different readings to such questions as the relation between the peaceful coexistence of the state of inter-state relations and the development of social contradictions inside the capitalist world, between the peace movement and the working-class struggle for Socialism.

Many bourgeois and Social-Democratic ideologists take peaceful coexistence to mean a *reconciliation of the two warring, irreconcilable classes*, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and say that it leads to a "fade-out" of the struggle between the antagonistic class ideologies, the Socialist and bourgeois.

Marxist-Leninists cannot accept this distorted . . . interpretation of the policy of

CAN DIFFERENCES BE RECONCILED?

peaceful coexistence which slurs over its class substance and direction and ignores the *irreconcilable antagonistic social contradictions of the modern world.*

The Communist Party has always acted on the assumption that the *peaceful coexistence of the two systems does not exclude but, on the contrary, implies a further development of the working people's class struggle. . . .*

The contemporary . . . general line of the international Communist movement does not freeze the initiative of the people, but, on the contrary, mobilizes them to a greater extent. *It opens up before all revolutionary forces of our day new prospects for successful advance.*³⁸

The Communists clearly recognize, then, that the West fundamentally *misunderstands* or *misinterprets* "peaceful coexistence" as a welcome alleviation of the "class struggle." The "class struggle" denotes in reality the unrelenting battle against non-Communist society everywhere, and therefore to alleviate the class

³⁸ T. T. Timofeyev, "Against Distortions of the Class Nature of the Leninist Policy of Peaceful Coexistence," *International Affairs*, No. 8 (August 1963), pp. 18-19. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

struggle is to slacken the effort to overthrow free governments. Such a slackening is hotly denied:

It is as impossible to reconcile opposing classes or eliminate the antagonisms between them as it is to have peaceful coexistence of clashing ideologies which reflect the basic interests of these classes. The struggle to win the hearts and minds of the people and their loyalty is inherently adamant and uncompromising.³⁹

Khrushchev feels that the West for some reason "deliberately" misunderstands the nature of peaceful coexistence, and stresses that, whether or not we understand it, Communism will continue to "attack":

In the West they do not want, or at least pretend they do not want to understand, that peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems does not mean peaceful coexistence in ideology We Communists have never accepted and never will accept the idea of peaceful coexistence in ideologies. There can be no compromise here. . . . In this grim struggle between two uncompromising ideologies, the socialist and the bourgeois, which is under

³⁹ "Party-Mindedness in Ideology," *Kommunist*, May 27, 1963.

CAN DIFFERENCES BE RECONCILED?

way in the world, and no one will deny this, we are attacking and will attack, asserting Communist ideas.⁴⁰

Under normal circumstances it could be assumed that two "ideologies" would be able to "coexist" without being engaged in a "grim struggle," since the two would not be mutually exclusive. But because the Communists insist on their understanding of peaceful coexistence, their ideology must attack that of the opponent, and must not relinquish the attack until the enemy ideology has been vanquished. The critical point here is that the process of combat is continuous and unrelenting on many levels, since the only way it can be brought to an end is for the class which creates the "bourgeois ideology," i. e., all non-Communists, to be eliminated. In other words, the combat ends when Communism has "won" in the fullest sense of the word.

Peaceful coexistence naturally has nothing to do either with the "legalization" of, or "reconciliation" with, imperialism. Being a form of proletarian class struggle, peaceful coexistence is directed toward making social progress easier and accelerating the inevitable

⁴⁰ "N. S. Khrushchev's Replies to Questions by I. Petra, Director of the Italian newspaper *Giorno*," *Current Soviet Documents*, May 6, 1963, pp. 17-18.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

collapse of imperialism as a result of its defeat in the economic struggle with Socialism. In other words, it is peaceful coexistence that creates the most favorable conditions for struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations.⁴¹

The offensive nature of the Communist attack is often muted by the insertion of a qualifying phrase, as is the case with the above quotation, which speaks of the defeat of "imperialism" in the "economic struggle" with communism. Such "qualifiers" appear when a particular effort to relax the situation gets under way. When the situation "deteriorates," or when it appears to be advantageous to act with particular firmness, the "qualifier" disappears, leaving the structure of the formula intact and more threatening.

Will the systems always be irreconcilable? Khrushchev's answer is that

no treaties and agreements between states can overcome the radical contradictions which exist between the two coexisting social systems.⁴²

⁴¹ D. Y. Melnikov, "Coexistence and the Struggle Against Imperialism," *International Affairs*, No. 8 (August 1963), p. 23.

⁴² "N. S. Khrushchev's Speech at the Reception in the Kremlin," *Current Soviet Documents*, August 19, 1963, p. 5.

WILL THE TWO SYSTEMS "CONVERGE"?

The remark of an official commentator underscores the dimensions of the gulf which separates the two systems:

Bourgeois ideology and propaganda are built on hate of mankind, lies, and slander. That is why we cannot reconcile ourselves to bourgeois ideology, that is why *we speak a different language and will never find a common one.*⁴³

The "irreconcilability" of the two systems, capitalism and Communism, is therefore not a Western contrivance; it is rather an integral part of Soviet doctrine and practice, an axiom which will for the foreseeable future guide the conduct of Communists in their affairs with the non-Communist world.

Will the Two Systems "Converge"?

If capitalism and communism are irreconcilable in terms of the present makeup of each system, is it possible that they can move together to meet at some mutually acceptable "middle ground"? Much speculation on the possibility of "convergence" has arisen in the West because of the rapid industrialization which is taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern

⁴³ A. Solodovnikov, "Speaking Different Languages," *International Affairs*, No. 11 (November 1963), p. 53. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Europe. Some have even contended that the pressures which such industrialization will generate will inevitably have an impact upon the policies of the Communist regimes, thereby moderating the radical demand for "control of the world."

In its simplest form, the argument for convergence holds that the United States will drift leftward to socialism and perhaps beyond, while the Soviet Union will gravitate toward a measure of capitalism. It is argued that with the passage of time such trends, which have already begun on a modest scale, will become more noticeable. In the meantime, it is contended, a "community of interests" between West and East will arise, in which the basic interests of each will find expression, and by means of which the security of each will be enhanced and insured.

While "convergence" attracts attention among some in the West as a conceivable "way out" of the present discomforts of world tensions, it is denounced and ridiculed as absurd by a Communist spokesman:

One of (the) strong arguments in favor of supporting the views about the possibility of a "convergence," for instance, is the development of electronics and computing techniques. The rational methods of economic planning and industrial management based on these techniques will . . . oust

WILL THE TWO SYSTEMS "CONVERGE"?

both the capitalist free market and the centralized Soviet system of management. As a result of this . . . the United States and the Soviet Union will within a few decades "grow so similar or at least so reasonable that hatred between them will cease."

A dream, perhaps a sweet dream, but one that will not come true. First, they ignore the fact that the social structures of these two countries are diametrically different.⁴⁴

With respect to the possibility of a "world government," it is stated that

the development of the weapons of mass annihilation, and simplification of their manufacture, will impel the two systems to seek points of "convergence" and agree to international inspection which will gradually grow into a "world government" placed above the still raging cold war.

This, it appears, is the end aim of "convergence," this is the path to salvation suggested by the apologists of capitalism.

The concept of a future in which capitalism and Communism will "converge" on an "equal footing" is Utopian through and

⁴⁴ Solodovnikov, *International Affairs*, p. 47.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

through. *The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will be the government of a world Socialist community in which there will be no place either for "free enterprise" or for the monopolies.* Neither research nor the subtle sophisms of the apologists of capitalism can save it from the death predestined for it by history.⁴⁵

In recent times there have been few stronger statements than this clear-cut declaration of the Communist view of the future, a future in which there is no room for an opposing system nor for divergent personal views. It is well to note that

life will always *smash* the advocates of ideological compromises and their bleak illusions and attempts to find a "third way" in the struggle of the two systems.⁴⁶

Rather than prolong the "illusions" of the Western world, Communists provide a form of "definite assistance":

Our Socialist world is definitely helping capitalism in one thing: *to dig its grave the more*

⁴⁵ Solodovnikov, *International Affairs*, p. 48. (Italics added.)

⁴⁶ Solodovnikov, *International Affairs*, p. 52. (Italics added.)

THE ROLE OF WARS

quickly. Such are the facts of the "fruitful" competition of the two systems.⁴⁷

The Role of Wars

If the systems of capitalism and communism are diametrically opposed, if there is to be no reconciliation and no convergence between them, and if the Communist goal of world domination remains unchanged, will war be the only logical alternative? The question of war is perhaps the most vital of our time. Never before has mankind possessed so many weapons of such great destructive power—hence the possibility that colossal damage on a world-wide scale will result if a nuclear war should occur remains firmly fixed in the minds of many people.

There is no question that the people of the free world in general and the people of the United States in particular do not want war; but what is the attitude of the self-declared enemy?

The Soviet Union does not want to go to war with anyone. We do not need anyone's territories, anyone's wealth. How could we covet anyone's wealth, considering that the Soviet Union possesses vast natural resources, a highly developed industry, wonderful cadres

⁴⁷ Solodovnikov, *International Affairs*, p. 49. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

of scientists, engineers, technicians, workers, agriculturists?⁴⁸

If it were merely a question of natural resources and industrial plants which divided the free world from the Communist world, there would be substantially fewer obstacles barring the way to peace. But we know that the key question is one of power, of Communist power over the rest of mankind. Hence such statements by Khrushchev and other Communist leaders are much less credible when viewed within the framework of their design for the world.

From the very day of the inception of the Soviet Union, Communists have attributed to the West a desire for war. The technique is still employed, and is in keeping with the Communist tradition of accusing the "enemy" of what they themselves are about to do:

The Communist movement believes that if the imperialists unleash a war, this would mean the final downfall of the rotten order of capitalism. But the socialist revolution does not need to have the road cleared by atomic or hydrogen bombs.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Nikita S. Khrushchev, Speech of August 6, 1961. Such statements evoke interest when compared with the actual progress of Soviet industry and agriculture.

⁴⁹ Dona, *Peaceful Coexistence*, p. 20.

THE ROLE OF WARS

And again:

There can be no doubt that a new world war would lead to the final collapse of capitalism as a system. However, this does not at all imply that a war is needed for the further development of the world revolutionary process, that the peoples must go into a world thermonuclear conflagration to culminate the struggle against imperialism.⁵⁰

As long as the Communists can accuse the West of wanting to start a war, they are able to engage in "sabre-rattling" remarks designed to intimidate the opponent. At celebrations of events connected with the military as well as at cocktail parties and diplomatic receptions, the Communists are free with accusations concerning the Western "mania" and "lust" for war. In 1963 they began to make more liberal use of the term "madmen" to accuse those who expressed doubt concerning Soviet intentions, and spoke specifically of certain American and free world leaders as "madmen."

Such accusations are also used to provide an opportunity to stress their own capabilities. These statements are by the Minister of Defense and a leading military theorist, respectively:

In developing the military might of our armed forces and raising their military pre-

⁵⁰ N. Inozemtsev, "On Peaceful Coexistence and the World Revolutionary Movement," *Pravda*, July 28, 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

paredness, we must vigilantly follow the intrigues of the imperialists and study all their habits. And if they still impose a war upon us, let the imperialist gentlemen then blame themselves. Soviet armed forces will crash down upon them with their entire all-crushing might; it will be the last war, one in which the imperialists and their whole system of capitalism will be buried once and for all.⁵¹

I would like once again to recall a remark by Defense Minister Malinovskiy that we will retaliate for the number of missiles threatening us with a simultaneous salvo of *several times that number* of missiles . . . and completely wipe out the countries that have allowed their soil to be used for American war bases.⁵²

The Soviets thus leave little doubt of their intention to wage all-out war should the occasion arise. Whether they will launch such a war to achieve their objec-

⁵¹ Marshal Rodion Malinovskiy, Speech at the Kremlin Palace at the Soviet Army and Navy 45th Anniversary Meeting, February 22, 1963.

⁵² Col. Gen. Vladimir Tolubko, "McNamara Boasts of Nuclear Supremacy," Radio Moscow, November 20, 1963. (Italics added.)

THE ROLE OF WARS

tives or whether they will rely on "nuclear blackmail" to attempt to force the non-Communist world into a series of concessions are matters of speculation for even the most skilled students of Communist affairs.

Regardless of who starts a war, it must be judged "according to the goals" for which it is fought:

Developing Marxist teaching on war and the army, V. I. Lenin, in a number of his works, set forth the opinions which became the substance of the principles of Soviet military doctrine. Most important of them is the proposition that *war is a continuation of politics by means of force*. This proposition permitted discovering the content of wars *according to the goals for the sake of which they are waged* and according to the role which wars play in the life of society. The doctrine of just and unjust wars was the result of this.⁵³

From this it "follows" that if war results from the expansionist politics of Communist countries, then one must judge it not from the point of view of who is the aggressor, but rather on the basis of the aims of each belligerent. And, since "imperialism" by definition would fight a war for the purpose of maintain-

⁵³ N. A. Lomov, *Soviet Military Doctrine* (Moscow: 1963), p. 5. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

ing its own system, even if that war were fought in defense, the goals which it would seek would be declared "immoral."

At this point the classical definition of "just" and "unjust" wars as interpreted by the Communists is applied:

A world war between the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism . . . would be an aggressive, predatory, and unjust war on the part of imperialism, but would be a war of liberation, a just war, a revolutionary war on the part of the states of the socialist commonwealth.⁵⁴

To the non-Communist accustomed to judging events by the traditional standards of morality and fairness, such a subjective and one-sided "doctrine" is repugnant; but when taken in the context of Communist morality and objectives, it is not novel.

But while the Communists may not desire a world war, they are quite explicit concerning their attitudes toward *other* kinds of war:

Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonial-

⁵⁴ Marshal V. D. Sokolovskiy, *Military Strategy* (Moscow: 1962). English edition (New York: Frederiek A. Praeger), p. 178. While this definition of "just" and "unjust" wars is of recent vintage, the concept has long been a key element of Marxism-Leninism.

THE ROLE OF WARS

ism exists. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissible but inevitable

Can such wars flare up in the future? They can. Can there be such uprisings? There can. But these are wars which are national uprisings. In other words, can conditions be created where a people will lose their patience and rise in arms? They can. What is the attitude of Marxists toward such uprisings? A most positive one. . . . These are uprisings against rotten reactionary regimes, against the colonizers. The Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles.⁵⁵

Any uprisings directed against "imperialists" and "reactionaries" are therefore deemed "just" and "progressive," and Communists are bound to support them. The least violent form of such an uprising is considered to be a mass protest or a strike, while the most violent would be an all-out civil war. The Communists feel that under such conditions there is little likelihood of a direct confrontation with the "imperialists," and hence do not hesitate to take a direct and overt part in leading an insurrection.

⁵⁵ Nikita Khrushchev, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, pp. 64-65. See note 7.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

As the Communists have stepped up their activities in the less developed countries, they have relied increasingly upon guerrilla warfare as a means to the seizure of power. That guerrilla warfare does not have mere local and limited aims is clearly stated by "Che" Guevara:

This form of struggle is a means—a means employed to achieve an objective—of seizure of state power. It is a necessary and inevitable objective for all revolutionaries. . . .

The guerrillas are the people's armed fighting vanguards operating in a certain area of a certain place. *They aim to carry out a series of combat activities for the sole, possible strategic goal: the seizure of state power.*⁵⁶

The Cuban specialist on this form of violence sketches the progress of a guerrilla war as follows:

A guerrilla war or a liberation war generally covers three stages. It begins with the stage of strategic defense, when the fast-moving and quickly disappearing small units will now and then take a bite at the enemy, but do not retire in a small area for passive defense. Their defense means launching every

⁵⁶ Ernesto "Che" Guevara, "Guerrilla Warfare: A Means," *Cuba Socialista*, September 1963. (Italics added.)

THE ROLE OF WARS

small-scale attack that can be made. This is then followed by the stage of stalemate when there will be activities by both the enemy and the guerrillas. Later on it will come to the final stage of the collapse of the repressive army. The guerrillas will now capture the big cities, fight large-scale decisive battles and wipe out the enemy thoroughly and completely.⁵⁷

The following passage from the leading Soviet monthly, *International Affairs*, is reproduced at length to impart the "flavor" of the "small bites" taken by Venezuelan guerrilla forces:

Nothing except the chirring of the cicadas broke the slumbering silence covering the Venezuelan state of Zulia. Suddenly a few bright flashes pierced the tropical darkness, the sound of explosions tore the air, and tongues of flames leaped skyward. For the sixth time this year guerrillas had blown up the Ule-Amuay oil pipeline belonging to the Creole Petroleum Company, an affiliate of the Rockefeller-owned Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. That attack on the night of September 19, 1963 was made by

⁵⁷ Guevara, *Cuba Socialista*.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

a group of patriots, men of the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN).

It is hard to list all the operations carried out by the intrepid Venezuelan patriots even for the short period of one month. They include the blowing up of oil and gas pipelines, setting fire to factories and warehouses owned by North American companies, and clashes with army patrols, raids on police headquarters and the homes of army leaders, seizure of radio stations for the purpose of broadcasting a message to the people The tactical combat groups . . . often engage in regular battles with the police in the heart of the Venezuelan capital.

At the same time members of these groups carry on extensive propaganda, distributing anti-government leaflets and posters, explaining to the people the aims of their struggle Tense days of struggle and the tremendous difficulties of underground work, which require not only great courage but real revolutionary self-sacrifice, have made the members of these groups seasoned town guerrillas. Houses and streets are their trenches, and residential areas their field of battle.

VIOLENCE OR NON-VIOLENCE?

*The war they are waging is in effect a war of political exhaustion of the enemy.*⁵⁸

Violence or Non-Violence? The "Transition From Capitalism to Socialism"

The question of *how* the international Communist movement will succeed in achieving further power in countries which are now non-Communist has been a subject of dispute among the various Communist Parties. It is also an important issue for the West, since we cannot assume that those who "reject the violent path" are necessarily any less dangerous to us in the long run. We ignore this important issue at our own peril, for a false sense of security could lull us into an extremely dangerous situation.

There is a long-standing misconception in the West that a superficially "non-violent" method of overthrowing a government is equivalent to a "peaceful" and "legitimate" political change. Such is not always the case, for subversion, intimidation, and pressure from outside may cause a government to fall prey to Communism, a system providing for no future political change. The most obvious example of a "peaceful" Communist takeover is that of Czechoslovakia in 1948, an event received with frustration and confusion in

⁵⁸ V. Listov, "Venezuelan Guerrillas," *International Affairs*, December 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

the West. In Czechoslovakia the Communists combined internal pressure from "above" and from "below" with external military and psychological pressure.⁵⁹

Whether the "transition" will be violent or peaceful depends, according to Khrushchev, on the conditions in each country:

Historical development has long since placed on the agenda the question of the advent to power of the working class in alliance with all working people. We Marxists describe this process as the transition from capitalism to socialism. Whether this will be a peaceful transition or not will depend on specific conditions in this or that country.⁶⁰

What kind of "specific conditions" determines the method used? The primary condition involves the degree of resistance which is put up by the non-Com-

⁵⁹ There exists an extraordinary document by Jan Kozak, Historian of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which explains in great detail how the Communists took over in Czechoslovakia in 1948. Two chapters of this document came into the possession of Western sources in 1959, and were reprinted in full by the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1962 under the title, *The New Role of the National Legislative Bodies in the Communist Conspiracy* (Washington: Government Printing Office).

⁶⁰ "N. S. Khrushchev's Replies to Questions by I. Pietra, Director of the Italian Newspaper *Giorno*," *Current Soviet Documents*, May 6, 1963, p. 16.

VIOLENCE OR NON-VIOLENCE?

munists, since the Communists hold that the ruling classes will never relinquish power voluntarily:

Revolution by peaceful means is in keeping with the interests of the working class and the masses. But if the ruling classes counter revolution with force and are unwilling to bow to the will of the people, *the proletariat must break their resistance and start a resolute civil war.*⁶¹

Needless to say, "the will of the people" is to be represented by the Communists themselves, and hence resistance to the demands of the Communists will bring about revolutionary violence. This bold formula for the use of violence puts on notice all those who contemplate "obstructing history" through their attempts to maintain law and order.

To be sure, the first time Khrushchev used this language in 1956, he simultaneously pointed out that war was no longer "inevitable." Many took this innovation as a renunciation of violence in general. It is apparent that he did not exclude all lesser forms of violence, nor did he rule out any combination of peaceful and violent techniques.

⁶¹ N. S. Khrushchev, "For New Victories for the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, p. 73. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Consider these three statements made in 1963 by the head of the Communist Party of Chile, his counterpart in Colombia, and "Che" Guevara, respectively:

I emphasize that this struggle has been developed in Chile because we have called upon the popular masses to take advantage of all the possibilities afforded by the peaceful way. We wish to take advantage of the favorable conditions of the presidential elections in order to achieve the front rank positions of power. Obviously we do not restrict ourselves merely to this position. I repeat, we know very well that the enemy will do everything to prevent the victory of the people, that it will use all possible means. Consequently, the popular movement is preparing to carry on the struggle in any field.⁶²

The revolution can advance for a distance along the peaceful road. However, if the dominant classes make it necessary through violence and systematic persecution of the people, the revolution may be obliged to take the road of armed struggle as its principal, but never sole, form in another period. *The*

⁶² Luis Corvalan, "The Nations Must Choose Between Coexistence and Nuclear War," *El Siglo (The Century)*, September 20, 1963.

VIOLENCE OR NON-VIOLENCE?

revolutionary road in our country could also turn out to be a combination of all the forms of struggle: elections and parliamentary action to sharpen the crisis of the anti-democratic system, strikes and mass demonstrations in the cities and proletarian centers; rural struggles for the land and guerrilla actions against official violence.⁶³

The real capacity of a revolutionary is measured by his ability to find adequate revolutionary tactics in every change of situation. By keeping all tactics in mind, he will exploit them to the maximum. It would be an unpardonable error to underestimate the gain that a revolutionary program can make through a given electoral process. At the same time it would be unpardonable to look only to elections and to neglect other forms of struggle, including armed struggle, to win power, which is the indispensable instrument for applying and developing the revolutionary program. If this power is not won, all other conquests, however advanced they

⁶³ Gilberto Vieira, "The Attitude of the Chinese Communist Party and the Unity of the Communist Movement," November 1963. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

appear, are unstable, insufficient, and incapable of producing necessary solutions.⁶⁴

Unquestionably the Communists would prefer to come to power by means of the peaceful method, but it is clear that they are prepared to employ any method which promises success.

Of particular importance is their *willingness to utilize the instruments of democracy to destroy that very democracy which guarantees them the right to organize politically and even take part in the conduct of governmental affairs.* In this respect so-called "national Communists," those who profess to swear allegiance only to the causes of the country in which they reside, are no less dangerous than their internationally-minded brethren, for they, too, have as a minimum goal the destruction of the democratic system. "National communism" is no less totalitarian and anti-democratic than any other variety.

Dissension Within the Communist Movement: The Sino-Soviet Split

In the West a great deal of attention has been focused (particularly by the press) on the rift which has developed between the two giants of the Communist camp, the Soviet Union and China. Many

⁶⁴ Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Havana Radio Broadcast (European Service), August 17, 1963.

THE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

theories have been advanced, some sound and others unsound, about the causes for the dispute: it has been said that China advocates violence as the only method for achieving the "transition to socialism" while Moscow expounds the "peaceful" method; that China harbors territorial grudges against the Soviet Union; that the Soviet Union fears a strong and industrialized China as a long-range threat to Soviet security; that China, as a "colored" nation, feels a racial antipathy toward the "white" Soviets; that China, a "have-not" nation, is jealous of the Soviet Union, a "have" nation; and that both the Chinese and the Soviets have in fact renounced "international" Communist goals in favor of achieving "national" goals to augment their own respective strengths.

Although this by no means exhausts the catalogue of theories which have received attention, the official statements of the disagreeing factions have included an unusual combination of exceptionally bitter charges and countercharges, personal attacks, quotations from the "classics" of Marxism-Leninism, and declarations of "fundamental unity."

While the debate has gone on at the highest level, Communist Parties around the world have become involved on each side, with the overwhelming majority of Parties siding with the Soviet Union. In some countries the Communist Party has been split into "Soviet" and "Chinese" factions, causing considerable

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

"fraternal strife," and in others a "neutral" attitude has been assumed. Both Moscow and Peking have actively sought to influence the Communist Parties of the free world, and on occasion have used a foreign Communist Party as a "mouthpiece" to say something they themselves would never say.

The Belgian Communist Party, long known as a troublemaking element, has very succinctly defined the issue between the Soviet Union and China:

The Moscow-Peking quarrel can be summed up by saying: "Moscow gives priority to peaceful coexistence, Peking to world socialist revolution." Are these two policies contradictory? We do not think so.⁶⁵

During the summer of 1963 there occurred one of the most heated exchanges yet to take place between the disputants: the famous "Open Letters" of the Chinese to the Soviets on June 14 and of the Soviets to the Chinese on July 14. Refuting the Chinese charge that the Soviets are slackening in the struggle to "defeat imperialism," the Soviet letter states flatly:

We stand fully for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be

⁶⁵ Roger Forton, "Peaceful Coexistence and World Revolution," *La Gauche (The Left)*, Brussels, August 2, 1963.

THE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

accomplished by class struggle, and as soon as possible.⁶⁶

The Communists repeatedly stress that the goals which both seek are the same, but that the difference arises over the tactics used to achieve them:

The Chinese leaders . . . affirm that the main thing is to get rid of imperialism as soon as possible at the price of whatever sacrifices may be necessary.

To be sure, we too want to see an end to capitalism, but it is through the struggle of the working class and its allies that we intend to achieve socialism, and not over the ruins of a thermonuclear war.

But if we are for the policy of peaceful co-existence between states, it is also because this policy is still the best way to help the international revolutionary movement to achieve its main . . . objectives.⁶⁷

During the latter part of 1963 statements which openly admitted that the dispute was over *means* and

⁶⁶ Open Letter of CPSU Central Committee to All Party Organizations and All Communists of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963.

⁶⁷ Waldeck Rochet, "Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France," *L'Humanité (Humanity)*, October 8, 1963. Rochet is Secretary General of the French Communist Party.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

not *ends* became increasingly frequent. In November the official ideological journal *World Marxist Review* sermonized:

The Chinese leaders will not get very far by trying to monopolize the idea, shared by all Communists, that the old bourgeois governments do not topple of their own accord, that as long as they are not "toppled" they will not yield power to the new, socialist governments. There is not a single Communist who will dispute this revolutionary thesis. *The argument with the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party is not about whether bourgeois governments should be "toppled," but about how they should be "toppled"*—solely by means of an armed uprising and civil war, or by various means other than an armed uprising, or at any rate civil war. In either case it is a question of revolutionary violence.⁶⁸

While at the same time roundly condemning each other, the Soviets and the Chinese rarely lose an opportunity to proclaim their over-all "unity and solidar-

⁶⁸ Pedro Motta Lima, "Who Is Revising Agreed Decisions?" *World Marxist Review*, November 1963, p. 53. (Italics added.)

THE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

ity," and express optimism that the future will bring a complete understanding:

The Socialist camp will in the future be united and whole, embracing all Communist Parties, all truly revolutionary forces. We consider that what unites the Communists of all countries is immeasurably higher than the differences which divide it today. . . . We believe that the difficulties which exist today will be overcome and that the unity of the socialist camp and the international Communist movement will be insured.⁶⁹

During the last days of 1963 and the first part of 1964, there were signs that the Chinese were becoming more conciliatory in their attitude toward the Soviets. While on a "good-will" tour of Africa, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai stated that

if anything unusual happens, the Soviet Union and China will stand shoulder to shoulder and arm to arm.

There are serious differences between the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties on Marxist-Leninist principles. But we believe that the results of such disputes will eventually be a solution on these principles. As for

⁶⁹ Alvaro Cunhal, "The USSR Is the Main Bulwark of World Revolution," *Pravda*, November 3, 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

certain countries which try to exploit such a dispute for their own benefit, they will certainly be defeated.

Remember, both China and Russia belong to the Socialist camp.⁷⁰

Then, during the spring and summer of 1964 the polemics between the two giants of the Communist world reached new antagonistic heights. Despite repeated efforts by other members of the Communist bloc to heal the growing schism, the Chinese continued to level one broadside after another at the Soviet Communist Party and at Khrushchev himself. After a six-month period of "self-restraint," the Soviet Union retaliated by issuing a summons to a world-wide conference of Communist Parties to deal with the differences between the two factions. Although the differences were serious and far-reaching, neither side appeared to be moving toward an open break.

Many felt that with these developments the two former allies would never again unite for common action, but would allow "national" and "racial" differences to come to the fore. Others, noting the advanced ages of both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, felt that the differences could be solved only through a change of leadership in either or both of the countries. Still

⁷⁰ Chou En-lai, Interview in Cairo, December 20, 1963.

AN EXERCISE IN DISTORTION

others felt that, should the split become final and irrevocable, the demands upon the defenses of the free world would increase, with both factions pursuing widely variant strategies designed to bring about the ultimate worldwide victory of the Communist system. To be well-prepared for different kinds of offensives, they noted, is the first ingredient of security.

The Communist View of the West: An Exercise in Distortion

For nearly half a century Communists in and out of power have systematically presented a vicious and thoroughly distorted picture of the West in general and of the United States in particular. Despite the ups and downs of international politics, through periods of "relaxation" as well as periods of tension, and even while Communist leaders wore their biggest smiles, this false view has been drummed into the citizens of Communist countries and has filled the airwaves and the printed page.

Year after year the Communists have launched propaganda campaigns about the "horrible crises" suffered by the capitalistic system—while capitalism grew stronger; time and again they told of the inhumanity, suffering, and oppression under capitalism—only to see their propaganda exploded by the realities of growing affluence and expanding freedom in the richest nations

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

of the world. To the dismay of the Communists, the gap between rich and poor, far from expanding, has shrunk many times. And contrary to their predictions that the class of the "proletariat" would grow while the rich diminished, the Communists have witnessed in the "capitalist" countries an unprecedented growth of a politically and economically powerful middle class, and a rapid improvement of the living standards of all others.

How are these glaring discrepancies between theory and fact explained in the Communist camp? More often than not the excuse given is that these are just "devices" with which capitalism "postpones" its last great and fatal crisis—"bribes" to the working class to forestall a revolutionary uprising, "pressures" upon the "internal enemies" of capitalism.

One great fact stands out: the West has grown strong because of its common consensus on goals and because of its diversity; there is no monolithic conformity under freedom, no suppression of individual creativity and initiative. Were the Communists to recognize, or to allow their subjects to recognize, this basic truth, the days of their system would indeed be numbered. But no such recognition is allowed, as this statement of Khrushchev demonstrates:

Some tourist may go to America, see one side of it which is zealously shown to him by peo-

AN EXERCISE IN DISTORTION

ple especially appointed for the purpose and, when he returns home, think: this is what America is like. When such a person deludes only himself, that is trouble enough. It is much worse if he spreads everywhere, as the only true view, the wrong views and impressions imposed upon him by hostile ideology. What should be done in this case? Evidently, such people who have risen to the bait of bourgeois propaganda should be corrected. And the Soviet people are correcting them.⁷¹

In essence, this means that an individual who, after visiting the United States, returns to the Soviet Union and gives an objective description of what he saw, will have to be "corrected." We are well aware of the methods by which Communists have traditionally "corrected" those whom they have considered "wayward." Even in art and literature the Communists feel constrained to employ the iron fist of coercion against those who rub against the Party line. In the speech quoted above, Khrushchev also made clear the chances for independent opinion:

Each Communist is entitled to his opinion,
but when the Party adopts a decision, maps

⁷¹ Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

out a general line, then all Party members toe the line and do what has been worked out by the collective thinking and will of the Party.⁷²

This is equivalent to saying that everyone may have an independent opinion on anything *until* the Party makes a decision. From that moment on, no opinion about the subject of the decision will be entertained unless it conforms with the established Party line. Because the Party decides, the rights of man must necessarily be curtailed "in the interest of the cause." Such concepts are completely antithetical to free world principles.

The following statement deals with the teaching of courses on capitalism for the purpose of "contributing to a Communist outlook," and is brutally frank in ordering that such courses be taught with a slant:

A course in capitalist political economics can contribute to a Marxist world outlook if the materials studied, incorporating a substantial amount of specific data, are presented in such a way as to show the changes which occur within the regime at the various stages in its development, and also the unchangeable nature of its exploiting characteristics and its

⁷² Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963.

AN EXERCISE IN DISTORTION

class nature. Furthermore, *modern capitalism must be systematically presented as a regime suffering from incurable ulcers and vices, and doomed historically to certain extinction.* This complex presentation, set forth with consistency in all educational and scientific literature and in educational and propaganda work, will not only promote a profound mastery of theory by the students, but will also help them to develop a Party approach to capitalist phenomena. It will contribute to the development of a Communist outlook *as regards the world of private ownership.* It will also make clear the methods by which capitalism is prolonging its existence under current conditions and will indicate the means of waging revolutionary struggle against these methods, against capitalism.⁷³

In other words, the study of capitalism should concentrate upon its "ulcers" and "certain extinction" because to do otherwise would seriously undermine the distorted Communist image of our way of life. Notice that such a presentation of capitalism is to play a role in shaping the attitude of the student toward

⁷³ L. Voznesenskiy, "Political Economy and the Formulation of a Communist World Outlook," *Kommunist*, No. 16, (November 1963).

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

"private ownership," a phenomenon which has never ceased to plague the Communist system. To this day there are self-styled capitalists in the Communist countries despite the all-out campaigns against them, including the re-introduction and extension of the death penalty (supposedly a remnant of "Stalinism") for "economic crimes." It would not be an understatement to say that the single greatest bugbear of the Communist system is *private ownership*.

One of the characteristic indicators of a nation's intentions *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world is the education and preparation it gives its citizens concerning that world. In the United States and in the rest of the free world, officials stress, and schools and churches and private organizations teach, that there is hope for the world's peace and security, and that men of good will can overcome the basic differences which divide them. When we contrast this attitude with that displayed by the above quotation concerning the teaching of economics courses, we are shocked. While we, on the one hand, feel that we need to know more about the Communist system in order to be able to understand it, the Communists precondition their people to hate and condemn us.

Consider carefully this statement:

The ideologists of imperialism, all the enemies of communism, are intensely trying to

AN EXERCISE IN DISTORTION

prevent our progress. They try to win over all kinds of unstable people. We say to those people: do not draw away from the people and the Party, step into our common ranks under the Marxist-Leninist banner, the banner of the Communist Party. If you have any revolutionary spirit, any enthusiasm for the struggle for people's happiness, any spark of hatred for our enemies, and faith in your people and their power, step under the great banner of Marxism-Leninism. . . . *And hatred for the class enemy is necessary because one cannot be a fine fighter for the people, for communism, if one does not know how to hate the enemy.*⁷⁴

While in the West tolerance and charity are emphasized as models for the behavior of citizens, Khrushchev is intent upon inculcating hate in the Soviet people. This doctrine of hate permeates the entire instructional and political system of the USSR, and has even been extended to the preparation of the population for war:

The political preparation of the morale of the people for war is of decisive importance. . . . One of the tasks in indoctrinating

⁷⁴ Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963. (Italics added.)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

the population is to expose clearly the reactionary essence of American policy [and to maintain] *our burning hate of the imperialists*. . . . *Hatred of the enemy should arouse the desire to destroy the armed forces and military-industrial potential of the aggressor and achieve complete victory in a just war*. . . . The political preparation of the morale of the people for war is *directed by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government*, and is executed by every governmental and public organization in the country, and by the whole system of education and public information.⁷⁵

What greater contrast between freedom and tyranny could there be than the maintenance by the Communists of an official indoctrination machine on the one hand, and the individuality and decentralization of our educational system on the other? We do not "prepare" our citizens for war in the sense in which the Communists do; but it could also be noted that, without hatred, we are prepared to repel aggression wherever it may occur. Without coercion and without hatred, the Communist system would be unable to sustain itself.

⁷⁵ Sokolovskiy, *Military Strategy*, pp. 333-334. (English edition.) (Italics added.)

CONCLUSION

Conclusion: The Challenge to the West

Faced with such a real and formidable opponent, the West must clarify and reaffirm the goals which it has so long sought to achieve. And if a just and lasting peace is foremost among those goals, then it will have to keep sight of that goal while steeling itself to meet even greater threats than those experienced in the past.

There can be little doubt about the goals which the Communists have set for themselves: they have been forthrightly stated on these pages by the Communists themselves, and are summarized by Khrushchev:

Capitalism . . . wants to bury the Socialist system and we want—not only want but have dug—quite a deep hole, and shall exert efforts to dig this hole deeper and bury the capitalist system forever.⁷⁶

Whether there will continue to be room on the earth for the opposing systems of capitalism and communism is a question which history alone will answer. For our part, we are willing to examine serious proposals for peace at any time; but "peace" on the basis of the Communist doctrine of "peaceful coexistence" is clearly an impossibility.

⁷⁶ Khrushchev, Speech at the Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

There is, however, a very real danger to the free world should it fail to judge accurately the intentions of the Communists. After some eight years of peaceful coexistence as the principal strategic line of the international Communist movement, we have no evidence that it seeks genuine peace with the rest of the world. Above all, it is clear that the Communists have not given up their long-range goal of world domination, and in the final analysis we must judge their motivations according to that goal. An intervening period of apparent "peace" and relaxation, regardless of how inviting it may seem, must not be allowed to lower the guard of the free world.

It is clear that when Communists employ the language of "peace," they do so to mask their true strategic purpose: the isolation, encirclement, weakening, and final destruction of the free world and its way of life. The cold war has not concluded, but has entered a new and still more complex phase in which the spectrum of psychological, political, economic, and class warfare will be radically expanded. Such classic techniques as subversion, espionage, propaganda, sabotage, terrorism, deceit, and incited disorder will remain and be refined; but the new techniques of nuclear blackmail are also to be employed whenever feasible. It would be totally unrealistic to hold, as some do, that nuclear weapons have only a military purpose. Long ago the Soviet Union appreciated fully the political

CONCLUSION

purposes of these enormously destructive modern weapons, and their early decisions to invest huge sums of money and manpower into their development indicates their willingness to attempt to attain real supremacy over the West.

During the period of peaceful coexistence, the Communists also hope to reap the benefits of a worldwide "detente," i. e., a relaxation of tensions. Under such conditions they would hope not only to gain through an American and Western slowdown in armaments, but also to subvert and paralyze hostile governments in the hope that at the critical moment such governments will capitulate or will be incapable of offering effective resistance.

The great paradox of our time may well turn out to be our inability to recognize that the cold war has in reality become more intense despite the increasing appearances of peace. It need not be emphasized that the overwhelming sentiment of the free world is to live in peace. But to mistake the illusion of peace for genuine peace would be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal mistake.

Our purpose in this great struggle imposed upon us by the Communist world is, as our Presidents and statesmen have repeatedly stressed, the victory of our way of life. If the clash between the two systems is,

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

as the Communists never tire of stating, irreconcilable, then our victory will not be achieved until freedom and justice prevail everywhere in the world.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ADVENTURISM—Error committed by Communists who incur unnecessary risks, or who profess "excess revolutionary zeal"; used by both Soviet and Chinese Communists in arguing their differences, as well as by Communists in general.

AGGRESSION—Any act which serves to impede Communist achievement of a goal; also any action by "imperialist" nations attempting to defend their own interests when dealing with weaker nations.

AGGRESSIVE MILITARY BLOCS—Those military-assistance organizations formed by the West to counter Communist aggression; e. g., NATO, SEATO.

ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTION—A problem or difficulty inherent in the internal relations of "capitalist" countries and between "socialist" and "capitalist" countries, and which can be solved only with the downfall of the capitalist system; as distinguished from a *non-antagonistic contradiction*.

ANTI-COMMUNISM—Any opposition to communism; recently used to refer to the "black re-

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

action" of democratic socialists and labor leaders who refuse to unite with, or express sympathy toward, the Communists.

BOURGEOISIE—Originally the middle class, as distinguished from the very wealthy; later enlarged by Lenin to include all property owners. In recent times it has undergone further enlargement to include non-Communist classes even in countries such as India and Ethiopia.

BREATHING SPACE ("Peredyshka")—Period of rest in which forces are regrouped in preparation for another offensive against the West, which usually occurs after a Communist advance has been halted and the "enemy" has become alert to further Communist aggression; a period designed to relax the enemy's defenses so as to facilitate the next offensive. "Peredyshka" means "pause."

CLASS ENEMY—Any class other than that of the "proletariat" which holds political power, or which stands between the "proletariat" and the seizure of power; also used to refer to anti-Communist elements within Communist countries.

CLASS STRUGGLE—Generally, the "battle" waged by the various classes of society against one an-

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

other; stems from the classical statement by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." The doctrine of class struggle in Communist ideology holds that classes in society are unable to live in peace, and hence incessantly seek to destroy one another. The class struggle recedes only when the "proletariat" (Communists) has achieved power.

CEMA (COMECON)—Council of Economic Mutual Assistance, an economic organization designed to serve as the "Communist Common Market," integrating and coordinating the economies of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries.

CORRELATION OF FORCES—The over-all "balance" of forces in the world; a specific term coined by the Communists to replace the concept of the balance of power, and used to demonstrate that the "correlation" stands in favor of communism and against "imperialism."

●
COUNTERREVOLUTION—The act of impeding the success of a developing Communist revolution, or of threatening an accomplished Communist revolution.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

DEFINITION OF THE EPOCH—A general statement by the international Communist movement describing the events which will take place within a given period of time, usually of long duration. Hence, the present epoch is defined as the era of "transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale," i. e., the complete victory of communism.

DEMOCRACY—Identified with communism in general; as opposed to Western democracy, which is "fascist," "reactionary," and "anti-democratic."

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM—The guiding procedural principle of the Communist party specifying that debate and dissent may be heard in the ranks on any given issue (the democratic aspect), but that when a decision is made from the top, every one must adhere wholeheartedly to that decision and toe the line (the centralist aspect).

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL CONTRADICTIONS—The process of waging class warfare in non-Communist countries for the purpose of overthrowing established governments or, at a minimum, to weaken the internal social and political structure as an interim measure.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

DISARMAMENT—a process in which arms production will be either controlled or discontinued and existing armaments will be abolished, but which does not rule out the use of arms for achieving the overthrow of non-Communist nations. To the Communists it represents a condition in which the ability of non-Communist states to combat Communist offensives is weakened. In 1916 Lenin said of disarmament: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie, can it, without betraying its world-historical task, throw on the scrap heap all kind of armaments in general—and the proletariat will doubtless do it—but only then, and by no means before."

ENEMIES OF PEACE—Those who oppose communism, Communist policy, and Communist "solutions" to international problems; Includes all *madmen, warmongers, and wild men.*

FASCISTS—Term of opprobrium applied to the right wing generally and bearing little or no relation to the Western understanding of the word. In Eastern Europe after World War II the Communists applied the laws established by the Allied Forces pertaining to "fascists" to anyone who opposed their drive for power.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

FORCES OF PEACE—All Communists; those movements which may have aims temporarily coinciding with Communist goals (e. g., the unilateral disarmament movement).

GENERAL LINE—The agreed strategy of the international Communist movement.

IMPERIALIST CAMP—The non-Communist, chiefly capitalist, group of advanced industrial nations. The leader of the imperialist camp is considered to be the United States.

JUST WAR—Any war which Communists fight. Hence a war initiated by the Communists for purposes of acquiring territory is just, while resistance by the opponent is unjust.

LIBERATION—The act of establishing Communist rule. Hence Cuba was "liberated" from capitalism by Castro's revolution, as were all other countries now ruled by communism.

LIBERATION WAR—Any war designed to establish Communist rule; any "just war"; also referred to as "war of national liberation."

MADMEN—Term of opprobrium applied to outspoken opponents of communism and to those who may oppose any specific Communist "peace" proposal. Hence, U. S. opponents of the Par-

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

tial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty were declared to be "madmen"; interchangeable with *wild men*.

MORALITY—Behavior in accordance with Communist standards; the qualities of a good Marxist-Leninist; the virtue of the Communist cause.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC STATE—Intermediate political form applicable only to underdeveloped countries which allows them to "bypass" the conditions of advanced capitalism on the road to "socialism."

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT—The revolutionary and anti-Western forces operating in underdeveloped countries and in colonial areas, which are frequently, but not always, led by Communists.

NEUTRALISM—A condition applicable to underdeveloped countries which weakens and erodes the ability to resist Communist advances. Hence, a nation passing from the anti-Communist camp to a condition of neutralism is viewed as being one step closer to the Communist orbit.

NON-ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTION—A problem or difficulty arising between Communist states or parties and which is soluble on the basis of Communist theory; as distinguished from an *antagonistic contradiction*. According

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

to both Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev, the contradiction between China and the Soviet Union is "non-antagonistic."

OPPRESSED PEOPLES—Any citizens of colonial or non-self governing areas; Also newly independent nations which maintain close ties with former mother countries or who remain in commonwealth status.

ORGANIZERS OF THE COLD WAR—Those who, from their official positions in government, have taken strong measures to resist Communist encroachment upon the free world, chiefly the United States and its Presidents since 1945.

PARTY LINE—The course of action decided upon by a given Communist party which must be strictly adhered to by all party members.

PEACE ZONE—A territory or area declared by the Communists to be "off limits" for all activity by Western countries. All Communist countries and many anti-Western countries are within the "zone." Non-Communist countries within the "zone" remain fair game for Communist activity.

PEACEFUL COMPETITION—A specific form of the "struggle" with the West designed to lead to victory; As portrayed by Khrushchev, "the stronger one swallows the weaker one."

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM—Seizure of power and establishment of Communist rule without the application of mass violence or civil war. Concerns only the actual seizure of power, and does not rule out the internal use of violence after power has been taken.

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC—A Communist state.

PRINCIPAL CONTRADICTION—The point at which the main forces of the Communist movement must be deployed; normally spelled out by major declaration. (A principal difficulty of the Sino-Soviet "split"; the Soviets hold that the principal contradiction of the era is between socialism and capitalism, and hence the main forces must be directed toward overthrowing the capitalist system; the Chinese insist that the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the colonial and oppressed peoples, hence implying that the way to defeat capitalism is through the underdeveloped countries).

PROGRESSIVE—Adjective used to describe anything which forwards the Communist cause.

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM—As defined by *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, "the scientifically confirmed ideology of the community of interests of the working classes of all countries and nations; . . . the

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

feeling of solidarity of the working people of all countries; . . . a definite form taken by the relations between the national detachments of the working class"; in short, a regulating principle reflecting the basic interests of Communists everywhere in achieving power, as expressed by the mutual relationships of the Communist parties.

PROLETARIAT—Technically the class of industrial wage laborers engaged in the production of commodities; also used to designate the Communists in general, and frequently used to designate all "toilers."

PROVOCATION—Any action deemed inimical to the Communist design. Hence, allied military bases ringing the Soviet Union for the purpose of defending against Soviet aggression are labeled "provocative."

REACTIONARIES—All-inclusive term applied to opponents of Communist policies, and often used in conjunction with other terms, as in "reactionary warmongers," "fascist reactionaries," "reactionary imperialist circles."

REFORMISTS—Those who seek to change the fundamental nature of the enemy capitalist society by persuasion and legal methods; those who admit that the class struggle need not be termi-

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

nated by total Communist victory, but by evolutionary change.

REVANCHISTS—Literally "revenge-seekers"; term of opprobrium applied chiefly to West Germany, but also to "certain circles" in the United States.

REVISIONISM—The ideological "crime" of revising or otherwise changing the content of Communist doctrine. Both the Soviet Union and Communist China have accused each other of "revisionism." The term is rarely used with specific meaning.

RIGHT WING SOCIALISM—The anti-Communist part of the socialist movement which refuses to engage in common action with the Communists.

SELF-DETERMINATION—In theory the right of nations and "oppressed" nationality groups to determine their own destiny; in practice it has amounted to the "right" of nations and groups to determine the method by which they pass into the Communist camp or to the "anti-imperialist camp" in general.

SOBER CIRCLES OF THE BOURGEOISIE—Those non-Communists who express a "proper appreciation" for the strength of communism, and who strive for "accommodation" with the Communist movement.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

SOCIALISM—Communism during its first phase, as distinguished from the final, utopian "Communist" society. No "Communist" country has laid claim to living under the second phase. To be distinguished from Western democratic socialism.

SOCIALIST CAMP—The Communist bloc countries taken as a unit.

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALISM—A higher stage of "proletarian internationalism" which governs the relations of Communist *states* with one another. The principle does not apply to relations of Communist states with non-Communist states, as these relations are based upon the principle of *peaceful coexistence*.

STRATEGY—As defined in *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, "the (political) line for a whole historical stage"; as distinguished from *tactics*

TACTICS—As defined in *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, "implies a political line for a relatively short period of time"; as distinguished from *strategy*.

UNJUST WAR—Any war waged by the "imperialist camp." Hence, the Korean War, although fought by the United Nations to defend Korea

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

from Communist aggression, was an "unjust war" for the U. N., but was for the Communists a "just war." (See *just war*.)

VANGUARD OF THE PROLETARIAT—The Communist Party, the "most advanced and most class-conscious detachment" of the working class.

VIOLENT TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM—Seizure of power and establishment of Communist rule by means of violence.

WAR OF NATIONAL LIBERATION—(See *liberation war*.)

WARMONGERS—Formerly those who opposed any aspect of Communist policy, as in "imperialist warmongers"; now used more selectively to designate proponents of military strength as the principal defense against Communist expansion, especially military leaders of the West and NATO.

WARSAW PACT—Defense pact signed in 1955 by the Soviet Union and East European Communist countries; an "Eastern NATO."

WILD MEN—(See *madmen*.)

WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT—Generally the labor movement; specifically, the Communist-led or Communist-sympathizing labor movement.

*



BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

Abshire, David M., and Richard V. Allen (eds.), *National Security: Political, Military, and Economic Strategies in The Decade Ahead* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc.). 1963. \$10.00

Chambers, Whittaker, *Witness* (New York: Random House). 1952. \$2.95.

Crane, Robert Dickson (ed.), *Soviet Nuclear Strategy: A Critical Appraisal* (Washington: Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University), 1963. \$1.00

Crossman, R. H. S. (ed.), *The God That Failed* (New York: Bantam Books). 50¢

Hahn, Walter F. and John C. Neff (eds.), *American Strategy for the Nuclear Age* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday). \$1.45

Hoover, J. Edgar, *Masters of Deceit* (New York: Pocket Books, Inc.). 50¢

Hunt, Robert Nigel Carew, *The Theory and Practice of Communism* (Baltimore: Penguin Books). \$1.25

Kulski, Wladyslaw, *Peaceful Co-existence: An Analysis of Soviet Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company). \$12.50

London, Kurt L. *The Permanent Crisis* (New York: Walker & Company). 1963. \$5.00

BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

Meyer, Frank S., *The Moulding of Communists* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.). 1961.
\$5.00

Niemeyer, Gerhart, *Facts on Communism: The Communist Ideology* (Washington: Government Printing Office). 45¢

Orwell, George, *Animal Farm* (New York: New American Library). 60¢

Petersen, William (ed.), *The Realities of World Communism* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.). \$3.95

Possony, Stefan T., *Analysis of the Khrushchev Speech of January 6, 1961* (Washington: Government Printing Office). 50¢

Shub, David, *Lenin: A Biography* (New York: New American Library). 50¢

Shulman, Marshall D., *Stalin's Foreign Policy Re-appraised* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press). \$6.50

Strausz-Hupe, Robert, et al., *Protracted Conflict* (New York: Harper & Row). \$1.50

Wolfe, Bertram D., *Communist Totalitarianism: Keys to the Soviet System* (Boston: Beacon Press). \$4.95

LIST OF SOURCES

NOTE

The 75 statements which form the basis for the study have been taken from a group of over 500 such statements which are in turn taken from some 165 articles, documents, and speeches of Communist origin. Over 90 per cent of the materials used date from the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962.

Every effort has been made to assure that no statement has been taken out of context or has otherwise been distorted. In addition, statements have been selected for their "clarity and forthrightness."

"Achieve Both Beauty and Quality," *Pravda*, March 17, 1964.

Adzhubey, Aleksei, "Talk on Peace Opens New Forum" Radio Moscow, January 1, 1964

Aleksandrov, V. "No Relaxation of Effort in the Search for Solutions to International Problems," *Kommunist*, No. 18 (December 1963).

"Along Lenin's Path to Communism," *Pravda*, January 21, 1964.

Arzumanyan, A. A. "Peaceful Coexistence and the World Revolutionary Process," *International Affairs*, August 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Astudillo, Oscar. "Revisionism of the Chinese Comrades," *El Siglo (The Century)*, October 14, 1963.

Aune, Marin. "The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence," *Fribeten (Freedom, Oslo)*, December 13, 1963.

Barrera, Filiberto. "On the Differences between the Chinese Communist Party and the International Communist Movement," *Voz de la Democracia (Voice of Democracy, Bogota)*, November 7, 1963.

Biryuzov, Marshal of the Soviet Union. Speech at Red Square on the 46th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, November 7, 1963.

Blishchenko, I. "International Law and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes," *New Times*, February 19, 1964.

Blum, Jean. "World Socialism and the Working-Class Movement," *World Marxist Review*, October 1963.

Boiko, Alexander. "The World Supports the Call of the Soviet Union," *Moscow News*, January 18, 1964.

Castro, Fidel. Speech upon Arrival at Moscow Airport, January 13, 1964.

Chen I, Foreign Minister. Interview with *Akahata* of Tokyo, October 30, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

_____. Interview with *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* of Tokyo, October 29, 1963.

_____. Interview with Takeda of *Asahi*, Tokyo, October 29, 1963.

Cherniaev, A., "Socialism Is the Principal Force of World Revolutionary Development," *Principios (Principles)*, Santiago), November-December 1963.

Chou En-lai. "Answers to Questions of the Middle East News Agency in Cairo, December 20, 1963," Radio Peking, December 25, 1963.

_____. Interview in Cairo, December 20, 1963.

_____. Speech at Banquet in Honor of Habib Bourguiba, Tunis, January 10, 1964.

_____. Speech at Mass Rally in Mogadishu, Somalia, February 3, 1964.

"Communism—The Invincible Force in Our Times," *Pravda*, November 24, 1963.

"Concrete Analysis Is a Major Requirement of Leninism," *Pravda*, July 25, 1963.

Corvalan, Luis. "The Nations Must Choose between Coexistence and Nuclear War," *El Siglo (The Century)*, November 13, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

"The Peaceful Way—a Form of Revolution," *World Marxist Review*, December 1963.

CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers. "New Year's Greetings to the Soviet People," Radio Moscow, December 31, 1963.

Cunhal, Alvaro. "The USSR Is the Main Bulwark of World Revolution," *Pravda*, November 3, 1963.

Declaration of the Central Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party on the Polemic between the International Communist Movement and the Chinese Communist Party Leaders, *El Popular (The People's Daily)*, Montevideo), October 2-11, 1963.

Declaration of the Twelve Communist and Workers' Parties Meeting in Moscow, USSR, November 14-16, 1957.

Dona, H. *Peaceful Coexistence—A Basic Principle of the Foreign Policy of the Rumanian People's Republic*. Bucharest: State Publishing House, 1963.

Dunayev, Commentator. "Day on Our Planet," Radio Moscow, January 21, 1964.

LIST OF SOURCES

Dutt, R. Palme. "National Liberation Today," *Marxism Today*, January 1964

Eremenko, Andre. Marshal of the Soviet Union. "War Must Be Wiped Out," *Moscow News*, January 11, 1964.

Fedoseyev, P. "The Materialist Understanding of History and the 'Theory of Violence,'" *Kommunist*, No. 7 (May 1964).

"For the Triumph of Creative Marxism-Leninism and Against the Revision of the Course of the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, No. 11 (July 1963)

Forton, Roger. "Peaceful Coexistence and World Revolution," *La Gauche (The Left, Brussels)* August 2, 1963.

Garaudy, Roger. "The Methodology of Marxism," *Principios (Principles)*, November-December 1963.

_____. "Where Would the Chinese Leaders' Theses Take Us?" *Cabiers du Communisme (Notebooks of Communism)*, October 1963.

Glagolev, I., and V. Larionov. "Soviet Defense Might and Peaceful Coexistence," *International Affairs*, November 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Gromyko, Andrei A. Speech to USSR Supreme Soviet, December 13, 1962.

Guevara, Ernesto Che. "Guerrilla Warfare: A Means," *Cuba Socialista*, September 1963.

Havana Radio Broadcast (European Service), August 17, 1963.

Hager, Kurt. "Comments on Policy Clash between Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties," *Informationsbuero West* (Western Information Bureau, West Berlin), August 1963. (Special supplement.)

Hawaert, Arnold. "What Wars? What Peace?" *La Voix Du Peuple* (The Voice of the People, Brussels), March 13, 1964.

Hoc Tap (Study), North Vietnam. "The Correct Way to Defend World Peace," January 1964; in *Peking Review*, April 19, 1964.

Hoxha, Enver. Speech at banquet in Tirana for Premier Chou En-lai given by the Central Committee of the Albanian Communist Party and the Council of Ministers, January 7, 1964, as reported by Radio Peking, January 8, 1964.

Il'ichev, L. F. "Social Progress and Philosophy," *Nauka i Zhizn'*, (Science and Life, Moscow), No. 11 (1963).

LIST OF SOURCES

Il'ichev, L. F., et al. *Talks on Political Subjects* (Moscow: Publishing House of USSR Ministry of Culture, 1964).

Inozemtsev, N. "On Peaceful Coexistence and the World Revolutionary Process," *Pravda*, July 28, 1963.

Kalugin, V. P. "The Magnetic Force of the Leninist Ideas of Peaceful Coexistence," *International Affairs*, August 1963.

Karlsson, Erik. "The Situation in the Communist World," *Var Tid (Our Time*, Stockholm), September-October 1963.

Khrushchev, N. S. *Speech at the 6th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, January 16, 1963*. New York: Crosscurrents Press, 1963.

_____. *Report on the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, October 17, 1961*. New York: Crosscurrents Press, 1961.

_____. *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, October 17, 1961*. New York: Crosscurrents Press, 1961.

_____. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, 2 vols. (Moscow: FLPH, 1963).

LIST OF SOURCES

Khrushchev, N. S. "For New Victories for the World Communist Movement," *Kommunist*, No. 1 (January 1961).

_____. *Imperialism—Enemy of the People, Enemy of Peace*. Moscow: FLPH, 1963.

_____. Letter to *Cumhuriyet* (Istanbul) on Ataturk, November 11, 1963.

_____. Message to Mao Tse-tung on 70th Birthday, *Pravda*, December 26, 1963.

_____. Message to the 9th International Conference for the Banning of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons, Hiroshima, August 19, 1963.

_____. New Year's Message to the Japanese People, *Moscow News* Supplement, January 11, 1964.

_____. *On Peaceful Coexistence*. Moscow: FLPH, 1961.

_____. Preface to the Italian edition of his Collected Speeches, *Problems of Peace*, in *Rinascita (Rebirth)*, Rome), March 21, 1964.

_____. "Replies to questions by the editorial offices of *Alger Républicain* and *Le Peuple* of Algeria, *Ghanaian Times* of Ghana, and *Botaung* of Burma, on the national liberation movement in the present period," *Izvestiya*, December 21, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Khrushchev, N. S. "Replies to Questions by Henry Shapiro, Chief Moscow Correspondent for UPI," *Radio Moscow*, December 30, 1963.

_____. "Replies to questions by Pablo Pesce, Editor of Uruguayan Newspaper *El Diario*," *Pravda*, January 2, 1964.

_____. "Replies to Questions by I. Pietra, Director of the Italian Newspaper *Giorno*," *Current Soviet Documents*, May 6, 1963.

_____. *Socialism and Communism* (Moscow: FLPH, 1963).

_____. "Speech at CPSU Central Committee Plenary Meeting, June 21, 1963," *Current Soviet Documents*, July 29, 1963.

_____. Speech at Moscow Election Meeting, February 27, 1963.

_____. "Speech at Plenary Meeting of CPSU Central Committee, February 14, 1964," *Current Soviet Documents*, March 2, 1964.

_____. Speech over radio and television, August 6, 1961.

_____. "Speech at the Reception in the Kremlin after the Signing of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, August 5, 1963," *Current Soviet Documents*, August 19, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Khrushchev, N. S. "Speech at the Soviet-Hungarian Meeting, July 19, 1963," *Current Soviet Documents*, August 19, 1963.

_____. *The National Liberation Movement* (Moscow: FLPH, 1963).

_____. *The Revolutionary Working-Class and Communist Movement*. Moscow: FLPH, 1963.

_____. *To Avert War, Our Prime Task*. Moscow: FLPH, 1963.

Khrushchev, N. S., and Leonid Brezhnev. "New Year's Greetings to Mao Tse-tung and CPR Leaders," Radio Moscow, December 31, 1963.

Khvostov, Vladimir. "Historical Necessity," Radio Moscow, January 9, 1964.

Kliszko, Zenon. "Peaceful Coexistence: The General Line of the Foreign Policies of the Socialist Countries," *Pravda*, August 9, 1963.

Kolliannis, Kostas. "Master All Forms of the Revolutionary Struggle," *World Marxist Review*, February 1964.

Korionov, Vitaliy G. "On the Anniversary of the 1957 Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers Parties," *Izvestiya*, November 23, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

_____. "Proletarian Internationalism—Our Victorious Weapon," *International Affairs*, August 1963.

Korovin, Yevgeniy A. "An Old and Futile Demand," *International Affairs*, April 1963.

_____. "The Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties and the Tasks of the Science of International Law," *Bulletin of Moscow University*, No. 3, (August 1961).

Kosygin, A. N. "Speech at Lunch Given by Ben Alla, December 20, 1963." *Pravda*, December 21, 1963.

Kozak, Jan. *The New Role of National Legislative Bodies in the Communist Conspiracy*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962. (English title by House Committee on Un-American Activities.)

Kozyakov, Vyacheslav. "The Policy of 'Undeclared War,'" Radio Moscow, February 2, 1964.

Kumpf, Fritz. "Dialectics or Metaphysics?," *Einheit* (Unity, East Berlin), No. 9 (September 1963).

Kushnir, Aleksander. "Application in S. E. Asia," Radio Moscow, January 8, 1964.

LIST OF SOURCES

Kuusinen, Otto V. (ed.). *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961. Second revised edition, 1963.

Kuz'minkov, I. "Communist Morality and General Moral Standards," *Kommunist*, No. 1 (January 1964).

Lazitch, Branko. "Soviet and Chinese Theses on the Outcome of a Thermonuclear War," *Est & Ouest (East and West*, Paris), No. 310 (December 1-15, 1963). (Non-Communist Source.)

Leira, Vigleik. "On 'Mad' and 'Sensible' Imperialists," *Fribeten (Freedom*, Oslo), December 7, 1963.

Lemin, I. "The Historic Mission of Communism," *Izvestiya*, July 25, 1963.

"The Leninist Course of the World Communist Movement and Its Adversaries," *Kommunist*, No. 13 (September 1963).

Leontyev, Boris. "Peace Call to the World," *Moscow News*, January 11, 1964.

Lima, Pedro Motta. "Who Is Revising Agreed Decisions?," *World Marxist Review*, November 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Listov, V. "Venezuelan Guerrillas," *International Affairs*, December 1963.

Lomov, N. A. *Soviet Military Doctrine*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Armed Forces, 1963.

Longo, Luigi. "The Historical Role and Significance of the Struggle of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," *World Marxist Review*, November 1963.

Malinovskiy, Rodion. Speech in Red Square Delivered on the 46th Anniversary of the October Revolution, November 7, 1963.

_____. Speech at the Kremlin Palace at the Soviet Army and Navy 45th Anniversary Meeting, February 22, 1963.

Mao Tse-tung. "Comrade Mao Tse-tung on 'Imperialism and All Reactionaries Are Paper Tigers,'" *Renmin Ribao*, October 27, 1958.

Mao Tse-tung, and CPR leaders. "New Year's Greetings to Khrushchev and Brezhnev," Radio Moscow, January 1, 1964.

Maurer, I. G. "The Inviolable Foundations of the Unity of the International Communist Movement," *World Marxist Review*, November 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Melnikov, D. Y. "Coexistence and the Struggle Against Imperialism," *International Affairs*, August 1963.

Melnikov, Y. M. "Critiques of the Imperialist Theory of 'Ideological Reconciliation,'" *International Affairs*, August 1963.

Meshcheryakov, M. "Strategy and Tactics of Communist Parties at the Present Stage," *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh sil (Communist of the Armed Forces)*, February 1964.

Mikhailov, S. "The Cuban Revolution and Latin America," *International Affairs*, December 1963.

"The New Cuba: Five Years," *New Times*, January 8, 1964.

Oesterling, Kjoeld. "Peace, the Nuclear Weapon and Politics," *World Marxist Review*, January 1964.

Oesterling, Kjoeld and Norman Freed. *Peace, Freedom, and You*. Prague: Peace and Socialism, 1963.

Open Letter of CPSU Central Committee to All Party Organizations and All Communists of the Soviet Union, July 14, 1963. New York: Cross-currents Press, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

"Party-Mindedness in Ideology," *Kommunist*, No. 8 (May 1963).

"The Peaceful Road to Socialism," *Unir (Unite, Paris)*, November 1963.

Peive, J. Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. "On the Peace Defence Law," *Moscow News*, March 14, 1964.

Perez, Jaime. "The CPSU in the Van of the World Communist Movement," *World Marxist Review*, January 1964.

Podgorniy, Nikolai. Speech Delivered on November 6, 1963 at a Meeting in Moscow In Honor of the 46th Anniversary of the October Revolution.

"The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence," *Tiden (Time, Copenhagen)*, No. 6 (1963).

Pravda, "For Marxist-Leninist Unity of the Communist Movement, For Cohesion of the Countries of Socialism," *Pravda*, February 10, 1963.

"For the Unity and Solidarity of the International Communist Movement (Anniversary of the 1960 Statement)," *Pravda*, December 6, 1963.

"Friendship and Brotherhood," *Pravda*, January 19, 1964.

LIST OF SOURCES

"The Full Force of Science in the Construction of Communism," *Pravda*, February 7, 1964.

"An Important Step on the Road to Strengthening Peace," *Pravda*, January 5, 1964.

"A Noble Task for the Peoples," *Pravda*, January 3, 1964.

"The Peoples' Desired Goal," *Pravda*, January 9, 1964.

"The Property of the People," *Pravda*, March 13, 1964.

"School, Family and Society," *Pravda*, January 10, 1964.

"Youth Answers the Party Call," *Pravda*, January 15, 1964.

"Commentators Discuss Disarmament Questions," Radio Moscow, February 2, 1964.

"Commentators Discuss the Future Course of the World," Radio Moscow, December 3, 1963.

"Commentators Discuss Khrushchev Note," Radio Moscow, January 7, 1964.

"Commentators Discuss USSR Influence," Radio Moscow, November 5, 1963.

"Commentator Stresses Soviet Rocket Superiority," Radio Moscow, November 12, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

"NCNA Told of Rebels' Struggles and Needs," Radio Peking, January 20, 1964.

Ratnikov, Col. A. N. "The Ideological Struggle in an Atomic War," *Morskoy Sbornik* (Naval Review), February 1964.

Rochet, Waldeck. "Concerning the Forms of the Transition From Capitalism to Socialism," *L'Humanité* (Humanity), August 2, 1963.

_____. "For Expanded Education in Marxism-Leninism in the Cells," *France Nouvelle*, October 17, 1963.

_____. "Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France," *L'Humanité*, October 8, 1963.

Rodriguez, Enrique. "Cuba and the Revolution in Latin America," *Kommunist*, No. 16 (November 1963).

Rotmistrov, Pavel. Chief Marshal of Armored Troops, "Interview Concerning the 46th Anniversary of Soviet Army and Navy," TASS, February 20, 1964.

Sharkey, L. "Creative Marxism is the Basis for Revolutionary Practice," *World Marxist Review*, October 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Shishlin, N. "Nuclear Test Ban Agreement—A Leninist Coexistence Principle in Action," *Sovetskaya Estoniya* (*Soviet Estonia*), October 23, 1963.

Shragin, Viktor. "A Roundtable Talk on World Events," Radio Moscow, November 3, 1963.

Sneh, Mosheh. "Chinese Errors," *Kol Haam* (*Voice of the People*), October 4, 1963.

Sokolovskiy, V. D. *Military Strategy*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1963.

Solodovnikov, A. "Speaking Different Languages," *International Affairs*, November 1963.

"The Soviet Position vis-à-vis Peking," *Kommunist*, No. 11 (July 1963).

Stalin, Josef. *Political Report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the CPSU(b)*, December 3, 1927. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950.

_____. "The Foundations of Leninism," *Problems of Leninism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953.

Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties Meeting in Moscow, USSR, 1960.

"Statement of the Politburo of the Communist Party of France," *L'Humanité* (*Humanity*), July 20, 1963.

LIST OF SOURCES

Statement of the Soviet Government, August 21, 1963.

Statement of the Soviet Government, September 21, 1963, "Reply to the 'Statement of a Spokesman of the Chinese Government of September 1, 1963,'" *Current Soviet Documents*, October 7, 1963.

Suslov, A. Secretary of CPSU Central Committee Mikhail "On the Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the International Communist Movement," TASS, February 14, 1964.

Timofeyev, T. T. "Against Distortions of the Class Nature of the Leninist Policy of Peaceful Co-existence," *International Affairs*, August 1963.

Tolubko, Vladimir, Col. Gen. "McNamara Boasts of Nuclear Supremacy," Radio Moscow, November 20, 1963.

Tomilon, Y. "Territorial Problems in Africa," *New Times*, January 29, 1964.

Trifonenkov, Col. P. "War and Policy," *Krasnaya Zvezda* (Red Star, Moscow), October 30, 1963.

Ushakov, Vladimir. "US Bluff in Panama Called," *Moscow News*, January 25, 1964.

_____. "Voice of Peace and Friendship," *Moscow News*, January 4, 1964.

LIST OF SOURCES

Vashedchenko, Vladimir. "On U. S. Reaction," Radio Moscow, January 6, 1964.

Vavilov, Leonid. "On Johnson Policy Announcement," Radio Moscow, January 9, 1964.

_____. "On Soviet Support for Panama," Radio Moscow, January 11, 1964.

Vieira, Gilberto. Secretary of the Communist Party of Columbia. "The Attitude of the Chinese Communist Party and the Unity of the Communist Movement," November 1963.

"The Views of the Paraguayan Communist Party on the Ideological and Practical Position of the Chinese Communist Party," *Information Bulletin—Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties* (No. 2, November 1963).

Viktorov, Commentator. "On the Significance of N. S. Khrushchev's Letter to *Cumhuriyet*," Radio Moscow, November 11, 1963.

_____. "On the East-West Dialogue," Radio Moscow, November 27, 1963.

Volskiy, Dmitriy. "On Senator Mansfield's Stand on U.S. Policy in South Vietnam," Radio Moscow, February 21, 1964.

Voznesenskiy, L. "Political Economy and the Formulation of a Communist World Outlook," *Kommunist*, No. 16 (November 1963).

LIST OF SOURCES

"War or Peace? Answers to Readers' Questions," *Drapeau Rouge Magazine (Red Flag Magazine)*, September 21, 1963.

"We and the Chinese Comrades," *Unita*, September 29, 1963 (Supplement.)

"What Does Mr. Harriman Really Want?" *Izvestiya*, November 12, 1963.

Yerusalimsky, Prof. A. "As Seen by a Historian," *New Times*, January 22, 1964.

†







AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

1963-1964

PRESIDENT

WALTER E. CRAIG, First Nat'l Bank Bldg.,
Phoenix 4, Ariz.

PRESIDENT-ELECT

LEWIS F. POWELL, JR., Electric Bldg.,
Richmond 12, Va.

CHAIRMAN HOUSE OF DELEGATES

EDWARD L. WRIGHT, Tower Bldg.,
Little Rock, Ark.

SECRETARY

GIBSON GAYLE, JR., Bank of the Southwest
Bldg., Houston 2, Texas

TREASURER

GLENN M. COULTER, Ford Bldg.,
Detroit 26, Mich.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

W.M. REECE SMITH, JR., First Nat'l Bank
Bldg., Tampa 1, Fla.

ASSISTANT TREASURER

ROBERT R. RICHARDSON, C & S Nat'l Bank
Bldg., Atlanta 3, Ga.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS * †

THE PRESIDENT.

THE PRESIDENT-ELECT.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

THE SECRETARY.

THE TREASURER.

SYLVESTER C. SMITH, JR.,
Last Retiring President, 1
Merrywood Drive, West
Orange, N. J.

RICHARD BENTLEY, *Editor-*
in-Chief of the American
Bar Association Journal, 120
S. LaSalle St., Chicago 3,
Ill.

Ex officio

BOARD OF GOVERNORS—Continued

1st Dist. . . . COLIN MACR. MAKEPEACE,
Hospital Trust Bldg., Providence 3, R. I. (1966)

2nd Dist. . . . CHURCHILL RODGERS,
1 Madison Ave., New York 10,
N. Y. (1966)

3rd Dist. . . . WILLIAM POOLE,
Delaware Trust Bldg., Wil-
mington 1, Del. (1964)

4th Dist. . . . FRANCIS W. HILL,
Tower Bldg., Washington 5,
D. C. (1966)

5th Dist. . . . WILLIAM B. SPANN, JR.,
C & S Nat'l Bank Bldg., At-
lanta 3, Ga. (1964)

6th Dist. . . . BEN R. MILLER,
Baton Rouge Svga. & Loan
Bldg., Baton Rouge 2, La.
(1966)

7th Dist. . . . EARL F. MORRIS,
Huntington Bank Bldg., Co-
lumbus 15, Ohio (1965)

8th Dist. . . . TELFORD B. ORBISON,
Union Nat'l Bank Bldg., New
Albany, Ind. (1965)

9th Dist. . . . HARRY GERSHENSON,
611 Olive St., St. Louis 1, Mo.
(1964)

10th Dist. . . . GEORGE B. POWERS,
Fourth Nat'l Bank Bldg.,
Wichita 2, Kan. (1965)

11th Dist. . . . JAMES D. FELLERS,
First Nat'l Bldg., Oklahoma
City 2, Okla. (1965)

12th Dist. . . . EDWARD G. KNOWLES,
Denver Club Bldg., Denver 2,
Colo. (1966)

13th Dist. . . . JOSEPH H. GORDON,
Puget Sound Bank Bldg.,
Tacoma 2, Wash. (1965)

14th Dist. . . . J. GARNER ANTHONY,
Castle & Cooke Bldg., Hono-
lulu, 1, Hawaii (1964)

* Year shown in parentheses indicates
expiration of term.

† For Sub-Committees, see page 2.



"...to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and maintain representative government..." [ABA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I]

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—STANDING COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION AGAINST COMMUNISM**

